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A STUDY OF EFFECTIVE ADVISORY WORK IN LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITIES

Abstract

Criteria of effectiveness were developed by asking advisers, advisory teachers, administrators, headteachers and teachers for examples of advisory work which they considered to be effective and their views of the reasons for this. These were then used to develop questionnaires for advisers, advisory teachers, headteachers and teachers in 4 local authorities, asking for their priorities and their views of 9 areas connected with advisory work - inspection, advice and support, teacher development, philosophy and approaches, knowledge, skill and experience, relationships, climate of the advisory team, organisation and management of the advisory team and the training of advisers. Three of these, inspection, advice and support and teacher development were regarded as key areas. Significant relationships were found between knowledge, skill and experience and the key areas and also between relationships and these areas. There was also a significant relationship between climate and teacher development. Relationships with other areas were not significant.

Individual interviews were held with chief advisers in all 4 authorities, also group interviews with advisers, advisory teachers, headteachers of primary and secondary schools and headteachers and staffs in 12 schools which had been inspected by the local authority advisory team.

In addition, a national survey was undertaken which gave details of the changes in advisory teams between 1992 and 1993.

Findings included the fact that there would be a decrease of 18% in the numbers of advisers by September 1993 and 38% in the number of advisory teachers.

Headteachers gave their highest priority to inspection and teachers to in-service education. Headteachers valued advisers more than advisory teachers and teachers valued advisory teachers more than advisers.

Separating advice and inspection, as was the practice in one of the authorities, did not appear to improve either and follow up was less effective than in authorities where these activities were not separated. The involvement of lay people in 3 of the 4 authorities did not give rise to concern on the part of teachers or headteachers. Primary headteachers and teachers were concerned about the credibility of advisers coming from a secondary background.

There is likely to be a considerable decrease in the amount of advice and support available to schools as advisory teams become involved in the national privatised inspection scheme and also in the appraisal of headteachers. In some authorities advice and support will be available for sale, but some schools may not be able to afford to buy it.
The findings of this study have considerable relevance for the advisory service of the future. The information about priorities should be valuable in planning advisory work. Team management and team climate will be even more important in the new situation if the demands of schools are to be met.

The continued existence of advisory services will depend, in many places, upon schools buying them and this in turn will depend upon how effective they are.
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NOTE

Local authority advisory officers are sometimes called advisers and sometimes inspectors. In a few authorities they are called adviser/inspectors or inspector/advisers. The use of these terms sometimes implies a difference in role, as in authority D in this study, but more often it is a matter of history and the use of the titles is fairly arbitrary. In this study the advisory team in authority A is called an inspectorate and its members are called inspectors. In authorities B and C the team is called an advisory team and its members are advisers and in authority D there are both inspectors and advisers with different roles. In any authority officers called inspectors may both inspect and advise and officers called advisers may advise and inspect or they may have different roles.

For the purposes of this study the term adviser will be used when the reference is general, except where the discussion is about inspection where the term inspector will be used. Members of the 4 teams in the study will be referred to by the titles by which they are normally known. The term ‘advisory team’ will be used to refer to teams in general but the team in authority A and the appropriate team in authority D will be referred to as inspectorates.

Advisory teachers are normally responsible to advisers and are paid on a lower salary scale. They differ from advisers in that their main role is normally to work closely with teachers and they have no inspection role. They are usually recruited from highly successful classroom teachers, very often within their own authority, whereas advisers, who are also recruited from successful teachers are usually recruited at a later stage in their teaching careers and as a result of national advertisement.
1 THE BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

The history of advisory work and inspection in schools prior to the Education Reform Act

The local authority advisory service has gradually evolved since the first local authority inspectors were appointed in London and Sheffield in 1872.

Inspection of schools officially began in 1839 when regulations for the payment of grant to churches and other voluntary bodies were set out. According to Gosden (1989) these had been paid since 1833 but in 1839 the conditions for payment were defined and included the right of inspection. Two government inspectors were appointed to see that the grants which were being given for the building of schools were being properly applied. Prior to that the National Society which was responsible for Church of England Schools and The British and Foreign Schools Society which was responsible for non-conformist schools both had their own inspectors. Gosden noted that the first government inspector was a barrister called Seymour Tremenheere, the second a clergyman, the Reverend John Allen. Neither appeared to have any educational qualifications for the posts and this would appear to have been the situation for many years. Gordon (1990) noted that at least 80 of the 93 appointed in 1870 had attended Oxford or Cambridge, many gaining first class honours. Sixty seven (almost 70%) were clergymen, whilst 50% had some teaching experience, though not in elementary schools. According to Gordon, patronage appeared to be a key element in the appointments made and teaching experience was not considered to be necessary. Sneyd Kynnersley (1908, pp.2,3) wrote of his appointment as an HMI during the latter part of the nineteenth century:

About Easter there came a letter to my father from an old friend of 1854, H. Sandford, who was a cousin of Sir Francis Sandford, Secretary of the Education Department, and had become a Senior Inspector. He premised the certain officers were to be appointed under the new Education Act - men who had graduated with honours at Oxford or Cambridge - and that the nomination was in the hands of the District Inspectors. He went on to enquire whether my father had a son with the necessary qualifications.

Now at that time I was a briefless barrister of something less than two year’s standing,... and the prospect of work with a living wage was alluring. ... The offer of appointment was accepted for me, and at the end of April I found myself an 'Inspector of returns'.

Rhodes (1981, p.3) noted that between the years 1830 and 1869 inspectorates grew up in various aspects of public life There were factory inspectors and mine inspectors, for example. He suggested that behind this development there were two important principles - 'that Government might interfere in economic affairs in order to protect the individual and that Whitehall might supervise local government in order to ensure administrative efficiency.'
In 1858 a Royal Commission recommended a system of payment by results which was introduced by Robert Lowe. This was embodied in the Revised Code, published in 1862. This meant that inspectors had the task of judging children’s performance in reading, writing and arithmetic in every school in the country and their attendance record and deciding whether or not the school qualified for the grant. This operated until 1895. In 1902 local education authorities (LEAs) were established and became responsible for seeing that there was adequate secondary education in their areas. Grants were therefore made to local authorities rather than to individual schools.

Foster (1983) noted that two local inspectorates, London and Sheffield, were formed in 1872. The local inspectorates were not regarded as being in the same class as HMI (Her Majesty’s Inspectorate) and they had administrative as well as inspection duties. He recorded that when the Education Act of 1870 made education compulsory, the size of Her Majesty’s Inspectorate grew quite rapidly from 84 in 1864 - 5 to 351 in 1899 - 1900.

The report of the Royal Commission of 1895 spoke of the appointment of local inspectors suggesting that if the local authority was to make grants in aid and to decide on the sufficiency and efficiency of the school supply, inspectors reporting to it were essential.

Rhodes (1981, p.101) noted that full inspection by HMI with teams of inspectors developed as secondary schools came into being after the 1902 Education Act. The intention was ‘to see that a standard, a rising standard of general efficiency is being maintained, and that the sums voted by Parliament for the purpose are being fruitfully expended.’

The National Association of Inspectors and Educational Organisers (NAIEO) was formed in 1918 and an anonymous and undated passage is quoted in its history (Dean 1991c, pp.8,9) describing the work of local inspectors as they existed in some of the major cities pre-war.

Foremost among the duties of local inspectors are reporting to the education committee on the efficiency of individual teachers and their suitability for promotion and assisting it to fill vacancies by promotion or transfer within the service, and to make appointments from without the local service.

Their organising duties are exceedingly numerous. In London, for example, the inspectors are concerned with the scholarship examination for entrance to central and secondary schools, advise on the staff of all schools, scrutinize timetables, settle doubts about requisitions of school books by headteachers, report on books and equipment which are submitted (by publishers) for inclusion in the list of textbooks and apparatus which may be used in London schools, settle points of dispute between teachers, attend enquiries into matters which may have gone wrong in a school, allocate and report on student teachers, give instructions to teachers regarding their work, settle differences about promotion (of children) from a junior to a senior department and so on.

In their more purely advisory capacity, inspectors give educational advice both to the teachers and to the education committee. In order to do this they have to be abreast of the latest developments of educational theory and practice. All local inspectors are required to hold conferences with teachers. Many of them give lectures to teachers, and they are incessantly engaged in discussing methods with individual teachers in the classroom. In short, upon the inspectors falls a large part of the training which a teacher receives after having commenced his professional work. On the other side they advise their
committees on plans of new schools and on structural alterations, on the organisation and reorganization of schools, and on every department of school activity and the developments of educational policy.

A later statement of the role of local authority inspectors and organisers is given in a paper from NAIEO (1946, p.1). This included the following:

The local inspector is freer (than HMI) to cooperate with the staffs of schools in overcoming major difficulties. He usually knows the teachers better than HM Inspector because he is intimately concerned with their appointment and promotion. More directly than the inspector of the Central Authority his function is to stimulate and encourage, to humanise relationships, to foster growing points and to develop independent thinking.

This paper spoke of the role of the inspector as the eyes and ears of the local authority and went on to stress the importance of his (sic) relationships with heads of schools and their staffs and the need for trust. It then spoke of his concern with the general efficiency and standard of the teaching, the choice, probation and promotion of teachers and the arranging of refresher courses and of conferences for heads and teachers.

The same paper also spoke of the role of organisers who were appointed for domestic subjects, physical education, handicraft, music and art.

Foster (1983) reported that local inspectorates did not develop very quickly. By 1964 only 50 authorities out of 164 had their own service. From an early stage there were two groups of people in advisory roles. There were inspectors who might be called advisers or inspectors, and organisers who were subject specialists, mainly in subjects where safety was an issue, such as physical education, home economics and crafts.

In 1968 (pp.xi, xii, 69, 142) a report was made by a Parliamentary Select Committee on the work of inspectors. They concluded that the rapid growth of local inspectorates should affect the size of HMI.

The inspectorate (HMI) should in general, cease full inspections and accept that the major responsibility for inspection should rest with the LEAs where their inspection teams are adequate.

The role of HMI would be to work with the Schools Council and 'to generalise the best practice in education and to act as a catalytic agent to promote improvement.' According to the evidence of Sir William Alexander, they should be a 'corps d'elite, a limited team of national experts in their particular field of work, who are thereby making available to the local advisory service the most up-to-date and worthwhile information and therefore helping directly in the in-service training of teachers.' He suggested that a national team of about 150 to 200 HMI would be sufficient for this role. He also stated that the only time a formal inspection was necessary for a school was when things were going wrong. Sir Lincoln Ralphs, giving evidence, stated 'I believe that the local inspector in a sense gets deeper into the local
An article by Fiske (1975, p.4) reminds us that the present was not the only time when advisers and inspectors were under attack. Nineteen seventy five was a period when cuts were being made in the education service and Fiske recorded that at the annual conference of the National Association of Headteachers 'voices were raised against the growth in the number of local advisers and insults hurled at their competence.'

Dean (1975a) reported on a national survey of advisory teams which compares interestingly with the survey she made in 1991 and the survey included in this study. In 1975 the teams varied in size from 5 in the smallest team to 61 in an authority of over 1,000,000. Around 65% of authorities had a chief adviser in 1975 compared with 100% in the 1991 study. In 1975, 25% had senior posts which carried responsibility for primary education. In 1991 there were 77% of authorities with such posts. Twenty seven per cent had senior posts for secondary education in 1975 and 67% had such posts in 1991. In 1975,18% of authorities had senior posts for further education although some of these advisers were not part of the advisory team. In 1991 61% of authorities had such posts.

The two later studies do not cover the range of specialist posts in each authority but the figures from the 1975 study suggest that things must have changed as a result of the National Curriculum. In 1975 there were 33 science advisers, 25 English advisers and 30 mathematics advisers compared with 47 physical education advisers and 46 music advisers. There were 13 advisers for religious education.

Bush and Kogan (1982, p.162) quoted from an interview with Robert Aitken, Chief Education Officer of Coventry:

HM Inspectors are just not available to give you detailed advice with detailed knowledge of schools. You must have it locally and, certainly, that was one of the arguments I used to develop the advisory service here.

They also quoted from an interview with Eric Briault, Education Officer of the Inner London Education Authority (ILEA) who stressed the importance of having an independent body of professional people who could give advice to politicians, administrators and teachers. He saw this as a source of strength to the schools and a way of making politicians understand the truly educational and professional issues in the decisions they were making.

Bolam et al (1978, pp.33, 80) found that at least 60 different names were given to members of the advisory service, though they were mainly called inspector, adviser and organiser. They noted:

Perhaps the most noteworthy reason for the undoubted shift from inspector to adviser, is that it reflects a trend in professional opinion away from inspection which is often seen as negative, to advice and support, which is usually regarded as positive.
The point is made again later in the book:

In the past it was accepted that local advisers would carry out general inspections and that this was one aspect of their role as 'guardians of educational standards in the LEA.' In recent years this has changed and the emphasis is now placed on the advisory aspects of role. This has been well received by teachers and heads but has been questioned by some politicians and parents.

They found that 51% of their sample spent some time on general inspections and 23% wanted to spend more time on this aspect of the work.

In 1972 the National Association of Inspectors Educational and Educational Advisers changed their name, substituting 'advisers' for 'organisers' and in 1992 the name was changed again to reflect the decision to admit people who were working independently as consultants. It is now the National Association of Educational Inspectors, Advisers and Consultants, (NAEIAC). In 1979 (p.1) NAI EA and the Society of Education Officers (SEO) issued a joint statement on the role of the educational advisory service. This described the purpose of the service as follows:

The purpose of an educational advisory service is to promote high standards of attainment, not only in basic studies such as literacy and numeracy, but also in education in its widest sense for pupils and students in individual schools and colleges and subsequent advice to heads and teachers and to the authority. The head and staff of an institution need advice and support in the development of effective forms of organisation and management, and teachers at all levels need advice on curriculum and teaching method. Moreover governors and managers of schools and colleges require advice from time to time on matters of curriculum and organisation and appointments.

The advisory team should be seen to have a leadership role in staff development programmes and a capacity to contribute significantly to the planning of educational buildings. The chief education officer requires a strong advisory team as well as a strong team of education officers to ensure that issues of accountability are dealt with satisfactorily and that adequate information is available on which policy decisions may be based.

The context of the study

The local authority advisory service has in recent months undergone enormous changes which are still in the process of being worked out.

The 1944 Education Act, Section 73 (3), paragraph 77, p.57, stated that:

Any local education authority may cause an inspection to be made of any educational establishment maintained by the Authority, and such inspections shall be made by officers appointed by the local education authority.

This was the authority for inspection until the 1988 Education Reform Act and the circulars which interpreted it. These laid greater emphasis on the inspection role of local authority advisory services. Circular 7/88 indicated that a key area where the Local Education
Authority (LEA) would have a lead function was in monitoring the performance of schools and giving advice or taking corrective action (paragraph 18) and that inspectors or advisers would report on the performance and achievement of schools to both governing bodies and to LEAs (paragraph 20). The same circular required LEAs to establish effective monitoring arrangements so that they had accurate and up-to-date information on the performance of schools (paragraph 151) and suggested that LEAs would need to evaluate on an on-going basis the success of local management in improving the quality of teaching and learning in schools (paragraph 155).

The Education Reform Act of 1988, Section 10, sub-section 2, p.8, stated:

In relation to any maintained school and any school year it shall be the duty of the local authority and the governing body to exercise their functions with a view to securing... that the National Curriculum as subsisting at the beginning of the year is implemented.

Circular 5/89 p.7, para 14 on School Curriculum and Assessment indicated that:

the local inspectorate or advisory service, together with the LEA’s advisory teachers, will have an essential role in preparing for, implementing and monitoring the National Curriculum and other developments arising from the Education Reform Act.

Circular 9/90, (1990c, paragraphs 31a and 31b, p.9) National Curriculum Assessment Arrangements required the LEA to make provision for:

- monitoring and quality assurance of the assessments made in their primary schools
- support for the professional development of teachers engaged on making assessments and of the ... staff employed to monitor and audit quality.

Circular 3/89 (1989c, p.18, para 55), Religious Education and Collective Worship indicated that:

an LEA’s local inspectorate or advisory service should also be a key source of advice on religious education and religious worship to the Authority, the Standing Advisory Council on Religious Education (SACRE) and its schools and teachers. Through inspection in all its forms, it should provide evidence of the quality of what is provided in accordance with the Agreed Syllabus.

Circular 12/91 (1991b) School Teacher Appraisal, imposed duties on the LEA for:

- preparation of LEA appraisal schemes and guidance;
- training;
- participation in the appraisal of headteachers;
- implementation and maintenance of appraisal schemes within the statutory time frame;
- operating complaints procedures;
- monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the scheme in schools.
All of these tasks were likely to be undertaken by advisers.
Initially the effect of the 1988 Education Reform Act was to increase the role of advisory services. The DES Circular 7/88 (1988d, Paragraph 151, p.31) Local Management of Schools, stated:

Effective monitoring arrangements established by the LEA will be a key condition for successful schemes of local management. In order to exercise their advisory and corrective role, including their power to withdraw delegation where necessary, LEAs will need to have accurate and up-to-date information on the performance of schools. LEAs should include in schemes submitted for approval a brief description of their proposed procedures for monitoring the schemes. In general the Secretary of State expects that in discharging their responsibilities under their schemes, LEAs will:

a) build on existing arrangements for monitoring the efficiency and effectiveness of their schools and
b) accord an increased monitoring role to their officers and inspectors/advisers and provide advisory and associated support to schools that give cause for concern.

The Society of Chief Inspectors and Advisers (SCIA 1989, p.6) produced a paper which set out the role of advisers under the new arrangements and stressed that:

each institution needs to be well known as a whole by a member of the advisory team if the service is to support the staff and governors in securing the institution's overall effectiveness.

This echoed a similar statement in an unpublished DES/LEA working paper (1985) and they went on to suggest that an advisory service needed a link adviser for each institution, specialist expertise in each phase of education, including further education, community education and training, early years and special needs and specialist expertise in each major subject and aspect of the curriculum.

Advisers at that time took on the advising and inspecting of further education colleges in some cases for the first time. Brenchley (1989, p.4,5) noted that this would involve 4 functions:

- Monitoring of expenditure;
- Evaluation of effectiveness;
- Development planning;
- Support and training.

He pointed out that:

There is often no other officer (beside the adviser) appointed to identify developmental opportunities, negotiate them into a project format and then 'mainstream' them into the most appropriate developmental structure. This emphasises a key intermediary and inter-agency liaison role.

This responsibility was subsequently lost as a result of the 1992 Education (Schools) Act which removed further education and sixth form colleges from local authorities' responsibilities.
In 1988, HMI noted that the role of inspectors and advisers was changing with fewer having direct control of in-service education and training (INSET) budgets and becoming more managers of INSET than providers. They noted that this change had created tensions and frustrations and uncertainties in the advisory services of some LEAs. This might be regarded as the start of the changes to advisory services which resulted from the Education Reform Act. They also noted that by the end of this year LEAs were beginning to review the management structure of their advisory/inspectorate services in order to meet the changes and challenges which were coming.

Parry (1990, p.13) noted that:

The LEA will need to know its schools in far harder and more objective ways; the school will need to value their adviser, and feel they know the LEA through him or her in meaningful ways which are worth the time spent on them.

Each of the advisers (within an LEA team) will need to adopt a fairly consistent style and practice and attach a seriousness to the function which will require, in some cases, substantial readjustment on both sides.

Hegarty (1988), describing a survey of what had happened in special needs following the 1981 Education Act, noted that there had been an increase in special needs advisers.

Matthews, (1991, p.7) described how Cambridgeshire was planning to devolve the funding of the advisory service to schools who would be free to buy their services or not as they wished. He noted that ‘the continued provision of these services, which would operate as “business units” would be largely determined by their market competitiveness.’

Gold, (1991) noted that statistics on advisers collected by the Times Educational Supplement found that there had been an increase of about 100 advisers between 1988 and 1990.

A paper by Burchill (1991, p.6), chief adviser for Wandsworth, published by the Centre for Policy Studies, set out the suggestion for a privatised inspection service which the Government eventually adopted:

An alternative (to LEA inspectorates and HMI) is to have a series of competing inspectorates, operating as consultants, licensed and empowered to inspect schools according to clear criteria. These might include some independent inspectorates and some linked to an LEA. They would compete for the custom of schools.

A letter to chief education officers, dated October 2nd 1991, from John Hedger of the Department of Education and Science was sent out with a statement from the Secretary of State setting out the plans for a privatised 4 yearly inspection service. It noted that the new arrangements would apply by law to all maintained schools, including grant maintained schools and city technology colleges. Inspections would be based on classroom observation. They would cost in the region of £70 million a year and the money would be found from
redeployment within the £135 million currently spent by LEAs on inspectors and advisers. The cost would be subject to market forces. In this statement the Secretary of State observed that the independent team of inspectors for any particular school would be chosen by its governing body. This was later changed because of objections in the House of Lords and the choice now rests with the newly formed central body OFSTED (Office for Standards in Education) developed from Her Majesty’s Inspectorate.

There was a great deal of concern over what would happen as services moved into a privatised inspection service. Davies (1991, p.131), for example, pointed out that when the money for support and advice was devolved to schools and they had the choice of whether they used the service or not, the ‘continued existence of a central team depends on a number of individual schools all taking the right decision at the right time.’ This meant that schools would have to pay for the service when they did not need it as well as when they did and this seemed to him to be an unlikely event.

Leonard (1992) took a more positive view. He felt that there would be sufficient work for a local authority team to maintain its present numbers. He took the view that the local team had clear advantages over the competition in that it knew the schools and the area and could probably supplement inspection with consultancy work in schools and with other work paid for by the LEA.

Rafferty (1993, p.5) wrote of ‘HMI fear of the third-rate service’. HMI had apparently written to Professor Stewart Sutherland, head of the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) noting the low morale and poor motivation being caused by the dismantling of the support service. The letter suggested that his leadership was ‘allowing HMI to be used as political cannon fodder in the establishment of a third-rate and ill-conceived inspection service.’

Nash (1993) noted that LEAs were tending to dispense with the services of further education advisers as they lost control of their colleges. Many of the older members were retiring early and much expertise and skill was being lost to the service.

The 1992 Education (Schools) Act changed substantially the provision for advisers and inspectors as laid down in the 1988 Act by setting out the arrangements for privatised inspection in place of inspection by the LEA. Each of the proposed private inspection teams would bid for the task of inspecting individual schools. Each of these teams would be led by a Registered Inspector and would contain a lay person. There remained the possibility that LEAs might still inspect their own schools but would have to recover the full cost of doing this from the schools inspected. LEA advisers might become Registered Inspectors or team members but would not be able to inspect a school with which they had a connection if the connection was such as to call into question their impartiality.
There were many adverse comments about these proposals. Hume (1992, p.6) President of the National Association of Inspectors and Educational Advisers, in his presidential address, described the white paper which set out proposals for inspection as ‘a mixture of overt prejudice, unsubstantiated mechanisms, some acceptable higher order aims and two important messages “LEAs, say your prayers” and “Actually this can all be done within existing resources”’. He pointed out that ‘A team of part timers will not be able to keep in touch with what is happening in the schools unless they are working in them regularly in some other capacity in addition to inspection.’ He also suggested that where there is 100% delegation there may be nothing for schools to buy back.

Sofer (1992) commented that what was proposed was far too comprehensive to be possible. The framework for inspections was very substantial and it seemed unlikely that even the most skilled inspectors could cover all it contained within reasonable time. Sofer also deplored the lack of opportunity for schools to be consulted about the framework.

The National Association for Inspectors and Educational Advisers (NAIEA) commissioned a report from Coopers and Lybrand (1992, pp.8,13) setting out the alternative paths available to LEA advisory teams. This noted the possibility of reorganisation of local government and recorded the increasing pressure on LEAs to devolve the cost of the advisory services to schools. The report suggested that:

- Schools will increasingly look to their LEA as a supplier of services to enable them to carry out their own functions but a supplier which has to compete with other potential suppliers for the schools’ custom.

The report goes on to identify the ‘customers’ of the local advisory service:

- the LEA - services including inspecting schools for the LEA’s own purposes outside the standard model of inspection of the Education (Schools) Act;
- the head and school - provision of advice and support for schools (which term includes governors and teaching staff) including inspections, to meet needs identified by the school;
- the parents and governors - four yearly inspections under the standard model of the Education (Schools) Act in order to report on the quality of the school to the parents and governors.

The report suggested that advisory services had four alternatives. They might provide LEA’ services, head’ and schools’ services and governors’ and parents’ services or they might provide LEA’ services and parents’ and governors’ services but not head’ and school’ services. Alternatively they might provide LEA’ services and head’ and school’ services and opt out of seeking to provide the new model school inspection services (parent’ and governor’ services). Finally they might decide to provide LEA’ services alone.

It suggested that there were two possible organisations which would meet the new organisation required - a separate cost centre or a direct service organisation (DSO) or agency.
Discussion at meetings of chief advisers and with the LEAs in this study suggested that the majority of LEAs were moving towards an agency organisation with some services provided free of charge and others for sale.

**The purpose of the present study**

The substantial changes recorded above would appear to be taking place for doctrinaire reasons rather than being based upon information about what is effective in the work of advisers and advisory teachers. While there is a great deal of work on effective schools and effective teachers, there is, so far as can be ascertained, no work on what is effective advisory work in schools. In the new situation it will be essential for advisory teams to be effective if they are to survive in a market driven situation and it is with this in mind that this study sets out to consider what is effective advisory work.

**Comparable roles in other countries**

It seemed relevant in considering effectiveness in the advisory service in this country to look at what happens in other countries. The list of countries is an arbitrary one rather than a selected sample since it depended on the availability of evidence. The evidence available also varied considerably from one country to another and is concerned with both inspection and support.

Ingvarson (1990) noted that significant change required peer support and technical assistance and that several countries had developed external support systems.

He suggested that the major elements of support needed in dealing with change were policy units, curriculum and research branches, consultants or advisers, school support centres, colleges and universities and special purpose programmes. Support systems were used by a school authority for generating educational ideas, for keeping them circulating and available to teachers and for providing teachers with adequate opportunities to learn how to use them.

**Australia**

Ingvarson (1990) described a recent report of the policy development project on Teacher In-service Education of the Commonwealth Schools Commission called *Teachers Learning* (1988) which recommended that state systems work towards a coordinated external support system for schools which included among other things establishing a school support infrastructure of consultants and resource centres. The report recommended also an expenditure of one per cent of the total expenditure on schools to be spent on in-service education.
Rizvi (1990) described a development in Victoria, Australia involving what were called School Reference Groups (SRGs). These groups were an attempt to develop peer group accountability in the context of the kind of development described above. Each reference group consisted of a teacher, a parent and a pupil from each school in the cluster group (normally a group of about seven schools). These representatives were to negotiate their understanding of the broad objectives of the group and moderate each other’s plans for curriculum reform. Each SRG was serviced by a regional consultant whose task it was to keep records of meetings and provide advice on regional and central issues. Schools were expected to submit plans to the SRG for funds and were expected to make amendments in the light of SRG comment. Schools also sent their self-evaluation reports to the SRG for discussion and comment. In the event teachers from one school were hesitant about being critical of another school and had some reluctance to be open about the problems schools were facing but the SRGs provided the opportunity for schools to share their experiences, their difficulties and their successes.

The consultants, who appeared to undertake a role comparable to that of advisers in Britain, were an important part of this process. They were the primary focus of support for programme development and link between schools, the programme committee and regional offices. Schools sometimes regarded them as having administrative responsibilities only and sometimes as change agents, facilitators, general curriculum consultants and educational listening posts. The change agent/consultant was the preferred description of the consultants themselves and it would be equally applicable to the role of advisers in this country. There were also some problems for them in supporting their regional offices in a situation where the regional offices sometimes behaved in ways which were contrary to the principles behind the programme.

Deschamp and McGaw (1979) noted that at that time the inspectoral role had diminished and was being replaced by an advisory role. There was, nevertheless, still inspection taking place in Western Australia where primary schools were inspected every 3 years but they were encouraged to have an internal review before the inspector’s visit.

In Victoria secondary schools were evaluated by Review Boards which included departmental inspectors, and others from categories such as parents, community members, academics and staff from other schools. There were some cooperative evaluation approaches notably in Queensland and Tasmania, where there was agreement with the school about the focus of the evaluation, working in a similar way to the four authorities in this study.

France

Lafond et al (1991, p.37,38) stated that there were 4 categories of inspectors in France The most senior was the Inspecteur General de l’Education Nationale. Applicants for these posts
must have held a position in the national education system for at least 10 years and hold a 'Doctorat d'Etat', the 'Agregation' or a recognised equivalent. Admission was through advertisement and an examination of applicants by a consultative committee. Until recently there had been no training for these inspectors but in future there would be training lasting several weeks.

The second group were the 'Inspecteurs Pedagogiques Regionaux' qualified either in a subject or in the area of 'vie scolaire'. They required at least 5 years teaching experience and either the doctorat d'Etat or Agregation. Appointment was based on file information. They had 14 weeks of training spread over their first year of duty.

There were then 'Inspecteurs de L'enseignement Technique' who operated in the 'lycees professionnels' and the apprenticeship training centres. These were selected by written and oral tests and an interview. They received 2 years of training.

Finally there were Inspecteurs Departmentale de l'Education Nationale who inspected primary schools. They were primary teachers with at least 5 years experience who held a bachelor's degree or equivalent. Selection was by written and oral tests and there were 2 years of training.

The tasks of the Inspecteur General de l'Education Nationale were as follows:

- observation and analysis of the whole education system, on forms of training, educational content, curriculum, teaching methods, 'vie scolaire' and the steps taken to implement decisions;
- participation in the inspection of certain teachers;
- participation in recruitment boards and committees for allocation and promotion of inspectorial personnel for management, teaching, direction and guidance and for the training of these persons;
- special duties allocated to them by the Minister;
- the coordination of the activities of all inspectorial bodies for pedagogical aspects.

Inspecteurs Pedagogique Regionale had 3 major tasks:

- to inspect and report on the teachers in public secondary schools and private institutions under contract;
- to advise or assist the 'recteur' in the area of their expertise;
- to participate in the studies of the 'inspection generale' on the topical areas for the year.

Inspecteurs de l'ensignement technique had the following duties:

- inspection and grading of teachers;
- pedagogical leadership and supervision;
- participation in teacher recruiting competitions;
- organisation of examinations;
- participation in 'academie' or 'departement' commissions or committees dealing with technical education;
- chairing the commission for the allocation (award) of the apprenticeship tax;
- participation in training activities, especially for the creation and development of projects.
Inspecteurs départementale de l'éducation nationale had the following duties:

- to make sure that schools are respecting official directives and fundamental principles;
- to exercise control over manpower resources and propose school opening and closing dates;
- to provide replacement for absent teachers;
- to evaluate the work of primary teachers and make suggestions as to grades for their teaching;
- to help primary teachers think over their practices both individually and in groups and to chair study sessions;
- To participate in the initial and continuing training of primary teachers and ensure that there is a follow up to training periods.

Holland

Bik et al (1991, p.35) noted that Dutch education was unique in that it provided for public and private education on an equal footing. Any group of parents wanting to provide education for their children which conformed with their ideas and beliefs might do so and receive state funding. This made the work of inspection the more important.

Inspectors in Holland were appointed in much the same way as they are in Britain with substantial experience in schools the major requirement for appointment. Appointments took place only once a year and there was then a 3 month induction period with 20 days spent on a course and the rest in practical training for the job. There was then supervision for a further 5 months. The principal responsibilities were:

- to ensure compliance with statutory regulations;
- to keep up to date with the state of education by visiting educational establishments of all kinds;
- to promote the development of education through consultations with the competent authorities, the staff of educational establishments and the regional of local authorities;
- to make reports and recommendations to the Minister, both on request and on its own initiative.

A school support system was formalised in 1986 by Act of Parliament. It was largely independent from the system for administering schools. Sixty five local centres had been established, each with about fifty consultants. According to Chapman (1990) these local centres were partly instruments for supporting, through training and consultation, the implementation of national policy. They were an attempt to coordinate the external resources a school could call on. About 2 per cent of the national education budget was spent on the support system.

The local centres established long term contracts with schools and were dependent for about half their funding on agreements with schools. According to Chapman, 3 things were impressive about this: the quality of planning for implementation; the degree of control the schools exercised over this planning and the long-term nature of the work consultants did with schools, which was consistent with research on effective forms of in-service training.

The Dutch plan was to use a mixture of a dissemination approach alongside change
strategies which came from the school. They took the view that good ideas for the classroom needed training and support which took them into the classroom.

The Irish Republic

MacGleannian and MacIonraic (1991, p.37,39) stated that inspectors were appointed as a result of public advertisement and interviews held by the Civil Service Commission. A new primary inspector worked with an experienced colleague for the first year observing him or her at work. If there was a significant number of new inspectors courses were held for them. Progress was assessed by the chief inspector at the end of 6 months. Secondary school inspectors served a 2 year probationary period with a formal induction period of 6 months, during which the new inspector worked with an experienced colleague.

According to MacGleannian and MacIonraic the principal functions of the primary inspectorate were:

- to provide the Minister with such information and advice as may be required on matters pertaining to individual schools and on educational matters in general;
- to cooperate with management authorities and teachers in the work of schools, especially by stimulating interest in the curriculum content and methodology and by assisting teachers in need of guidance.

The principal functions of the secondary inspectorate were:

- inspection of schools and teachers;
- investigating complaints related to disciplinary matters in schools;
- effecting humanitarian missions to resolve school placement problems of certain pupils;
- liaising with education departments in universities which provide pre-service training;
- conducting tests in oral Irish for secondary teachers to become registered;
- registering teachers;
- investigating the efficiency of newly appointed teachers and monitoring teachers on probation;
- initiation of curriculum development projects and monitoring of same;
- supervising and implementing in-service courses;
- participating in appointment boards which select teachers for posts in comprehensive and community schools;
- representing the Minister on Boards of management of comprehensive schools;
- representing the Minister on committees of the National Council for Curriculum and Assessment;
- effecting with Vocational Branch Inspectors the overall supervision and moderation of the intermediate and leaving certificate examinations;
- processing examination appeals.

Italy

Accardo et al (1991, p.29,33,44) described inspectors in Italy as 'subject specialists who were selected from the ranks of nursery, primary, secondary school teachers with at least 9 years experience and from the ranks of headmasters (sic) and principals, who by definition are graduate'. They were selected as a result of 4 tests which included the writing of 3 essays and an oral interview. Would-be primary inspectors had to write a further essay on social-cultural
problems and secondary candidates were tested on the teaching of their subjects.

There was no formal training and Accardo et al. commented that 'Selection is so severe that that newly appointed inspectors are usually first quality professional people whose competence and motivation are out of question.' There is a probationary period of 180 days, however.

They recorded the responsibilities of inspectors as follows:

- technical inspectors help to promote and coordinate the training of the heads and teaching staff of all schools;
- they make proposals and offer advice on curricula and examination tests and their adjustment to needs, on the use of teaching aids and learning technologies, as well as on the experimentation projects coordinated by them;
- they give technical/didactic assistance to schools and carry out all inspections ordered by the Minister;
- technical inspectors carry out study and research as well as providing expert advice for and on behalf of the Minister etc.;
- at the end of each school year the inspectorate writes a report on the general state and trend of education and the school system.

Japan

A Japanese colleague, Professor Akira Kuroda, (1992) in a personal letter, described the pattern of inspection in his country as follows:

In Japan, the local (prefectural and municipal) Board of Education is in charge of the inspection of local public schools. There are local (municipal) Boards of Education under the Prefectural Boards of Education.

The boards of education administer two kinds of inspection. The one is about general management of schools, that is, financial documents, books of the records of pupils and students, the maintenance of facilities and provision and so on. The other one is the inspection of the curriculum and guidance of schools and their administration. The relevant sections of the Board are in charge of the first type of inspection and advisers of the Board of Education are responsible for the inspection of the curriculum and guidance of the schools.

Once in every few years, a group of people from the Board of Education make a school visit to audit the financial documents and books and records of pupils and students.

Every school is required to submit its curriculum for the next year to the Board of Education around February, before the end of the school year in March. The school submits the timetable of classes for the next school year to the Board of Education too.

On receiving the curriculum and timetables from schools, the Board of Education gives advice and directions if it thinks this is necessary.

Advisers are appointed from among teachers who have passed the test to be qualified to advisoryship of the Board of Education. The test is administered every year and only those teachers who are recommended by principals of schools can take the test given by the prefectural Board of Education. Those who are eligible to take the test are over 35 years of age. After serving as an adviser for some years, he(sic) often goes back to school as a principal or assistant principal.

There are two types of school visit by advisers of the local Board:
- to attend demonstration classes being requested by the principal;
- visits to a school to make an inspection of the general school management, to talk with the principal, and to meet the teachers of the school. This is also a visit made at the request of the principal of the school.
Advisers of the local Board of Education are generally respected by teachers. However, when the specialties of the advisers are not paid proper regard to by the Board, they are not necessarily respected. (e.g. an adviser experienced in junior high school education is sent to a primary school to attend a demonstration class and is asked to make some comments and advices (sic) concerning the class teaching just demonstrated.)

A principal is under the obligation of submitting reports to the local Board rating the efficiency of the teachers. The Board of Education engages in the personnel administration and the appointment of principals and assistant principals on the basis of the reports submitted annually by principals. At present neither increase nor cutting in pay is made on the basis of these reports.

Not only principals and assistant principals give support and help to teachers, but also education centres in the local community and hold meetings, workshops and conferences for the study and training of teachers. They give counsel and advices to teachers too. The in-service training is given to teachers according to their teaching experience and the subject of teaching as well as the roles they take in schools.

A national system to give a series of in-service education and training to newly employed teachers in their first year started in 1989.

Greenlees (1992) noted that fewer than 50 inspectors were employed by Japan’s Ministry of Education to carry out inspections and to make sure that the country’s high educational standards are maintained. This meant that formal visits were limited and normally restricted to checking on teachers’ and pupils’ perceptions of the national curriculum. There appeared to be considerable emphasis on inspecting text books and this was much criticised.

**Portugal**

Neves *et al* (1991, p.47) stated that pedagogical inspectors in Portugal were selected from teachers. Five years teaching was required from prospective primary inspectors and 3 years from those who wished to work in secondary schools and usually some successful experience of a senior post in school. Posts were advertised and selection was by interview.

Primary school inspectors had to attend a course lasting about a year but secondary inspectors had a probationary period and some practice was supervised by a senior inspector. The duties of inspectors included the following:

- providing systematic technical assistance to schools in order to improve their performances and correct any irregularities;
- monitoring the education system and reporting on its performance;
- monitoring the implementation of new policies;
- facilitating pedagogical innovation and school development in order to achieve high quality standards of education;
- giving support to individual teachers;
- running occasional short courses for teachers (primary);
- ensuring the statutory regulations are observed;
- disciplinary action related to pedagogical matters;
- supervising Portuguese teaching abroad.
New Zealand

New Zealand has adopted devolution to schools in a rather similar way to Britain. Caldwell (1990) noted that there were staff at system level whose task was mainly to monitor (or audit) operations at the school level and to provide limited support to schools. In general, however, the support for schools would be secured in a quasi-free market in which schools would plan and acquire the services they needed from whatever source they felt appropriate and using their own funds.

Roe (1990, pp. 43, 53) noted that funding had passed to single school boards elected by parents. Property supervision, personnel, finance and professional guidance had been removed from regional boards and quality assurance was to be maintained 'by an independent review and audit agency, charged with measuring the educational and managerial achievements of schools by school visits every two years.' The review team would consist of one or more ‘curriculum specialists’, a coopted principal, a community representative and a financial/property management officer.

Advisers were assigned to colleges of education and were seen as ‘free-standing, client driven supporters of schools.’ Colleges of education were responsible for the advisory service and for a network of teacher resource centres developed over the years by the department of Education Board initiatives.

Spain

According to Ballarin et al (1991) in Spain the post of inspector was achieved by competition which involved a merit scheme in which degrees and years of teaching and in senior posts were given points and there was also an examination. Candidates then had to undergo considerable training. Their tasks were then to see that the law was observed; to evaluate the educational performance of the system; to collaborate on educational reforms, on in-service education for teachers, experimental programmes in education and on the study of educational needs in the various areas, and to provide advice to the various members of the school community.

Conclusions

This information suggested that a large number of countries, particularly those in Europe, were concerned about inspection and some had much more stringent systems for selecting and training inspectors than we do. Rhodes (1981, p.xi) wrote of ‘enforcement inspectorates’ whose task was to ensure compliance with statutory requirements and ‘efficiency inspectorates’ which existed to ‘secure, maintain or improve standards of performance’. He placed Her Majesty’s Inspectorate and local inspectors clearly in the efficiency inspectorate
Some national inspectorates appear to be much nearer to enforcement inspectorates although they all have an element of efficiency inspection. Apart from Holland there appear to be few which provide support for teachers in a similar way to our local authority advisory services. In contrast New Zealand appears to have gone down the same road as Britain is currently treading and appears to be trying to sort out the problems that this route poses.

The aims of the service

A study of the effectiveness of the LEA advisory service needs to start by looking at what the service is aiming to do. In 1984 (pp.1 - 6) the Department of Education and Science (DES) brought together representatives of the advisory services, Chief Education Officers (CEOs) and deputy CEOs, a member of Her Majesty’s Inspectorate (HMI) and representatives of various departments within the DES to draw up a statement about the advisory services. (cf. p. 7)) This resulted in a paper which defined the role, but was never published. The role of local authority advisers and inspectors was defined as including the following:

- monitoring and evaluating the work of the authority’s education service;
- (undertaking) work in support of schools and other educational establishments;
- supporting and developing teachers and advising on their management;
- (undertaking) work on local and national initiatives.

The Education Reform Act of 1988 brought a somewhat changed role for the local advisory service. Sir David Hancock, Permanent Secretary to the Department on Education and Science gave a talk to the Executive of the National Association of Inspectors and Educational Advisers in January 1988 which was published as a supplement to the advisers’ and inspectors’ journal Perspective in July 1988 (p.1). It included this statement:

The local inspectorates will need to monitor and evaluate school performance. They will need to provide LEAs and the schools themselves with trusted and informed professional advice, based on first-hand observation of what schools are actually doing, of the way they are implementing the National Curriculum and of the standards achieved.

The Audit Commission (1989, p.40,41) made a survey of advisory services and published its findings under the title Assuring quality in education. This included a job description for an adviser or inspector which listed the duties as follows:

1 To participate in activities by means of which the inspectorate monitors education in schools and colleges maintained by the authority. These activities include:
   - observation of work in classrooms;
   - maintenance of guidelines for use in this observation;
   - recording of observations;
analysis of information on schools’ and colleges’ work, both the inspectorate’s and information originating from other sources; reporting the results of educational monitoring;

2 On behalf of the chief education officer, to provide advice to governing bodies on appointments of staff to schools and colleges.

3 To investigate complaints received by the authority about schools and colleges from members, electors, parents or students and to take or initiate appropriate action.

4 To advise staff and governing bodies of colleges on means of achieving improvements in education in their institutions. To deploy advisory teachers to assist in the furtherance of these improvements.

5 To participate in the planning and management of the authority’s programme of in-service education and training for the education service.

6 To provide the chief education officer with advice to inform the authority’s decisions on the exercise of its direct educational responsibilities. These include withdrawal of delegation from governing bodies, major changes to schools and colleges (including opening, closure and amalgamation) and changes to budget allocation formulae.

7 To act as the authority’s assigned inspector for certain assigned schools and colleges. In this capacity the inspector will be required to maintain a general awareness of the range and quality of work within those institutions and to act as the first point of contact between the institutions and the education department.

8 Subject to priorities determined by the chief inspector, to collaborate with school and college staff in the development of their educational work.

The publication of the Audit Commission and a survey of advisory service by Stillman and Grant (1989), together with the passing of the Education Reform Act, resulted in many changes in LEA advisory services, which reformed in order to provide inspection on a larger scale than before or, in some cases, for the first time. As part of these changes, most services made statements of aims recorded in internal papers. A number of these were summed up in a set of aims by Dean (1992 p.12)

1 To monitor, evaluate and report upon the quality of educational provision and the standards of learning and the implementation of local and national policy objectives.

2 To provide the LEA with the information and advice needed to shape policy.

3 To provide a coordinated programme of advice and support for all schools and other institutions, particularly in the implementation of the National Curriculum and in the management of resources.

4 To promote the professional development of all teaching staff.

5 To promote curriculum development, particularly in those areas not covered by the National Curriculum.

6 To offer advice and guidance to governors and headteachers on teaching appointments.

7 To provide support and advice for the appraisal schemes of schools and colleges.

8 To develop the work of the service and the individuals within it.
2 SURVEY OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

Findings of other studies referring to effectiveness

Effectiveness and advisers
There do not appear to be any studies which are directly concerned with effectiveness as an issue in the advisory service, but there are many studies and articles which are relevant to this.

Rhodes (1981, p.115, 203) wrote of effectiveness among HMI and said:

Given the role of the inspectorate as a body which is formally required to carry out inspections but functions in effect as a body of professional advisers based mainly in the field, it is particularly difficult to judge its effectiveness.

Rhodes suggested that one could say that the work of the inspectorate should be judged on whether the general standards and progress of education are satisfactory but he pointed out that there is no general agreement about standards. Much the same could be said about local authority advisers.

He noted that:

Inspection not linked to specific regulations but to a more general promotion of standards ... is not susceptible to accurate assessment. Success depends on a variety of factors, including the professional calibre of the advisers and the political and administrative context within which they operate. The judgement of what constitutes success is perhaps even more difficult to determine.

...One element which is missing in the present situation is a more precise and systematic attempt to evaluate the work of inspection and promotion.

The study which comes nearest to being a study of effectiveness is that by Winkley (1985) who studied the management styles of four different Local Education Authority (LEA) advisory teams, looking particularly at the integration of the advisory service into the overall organisation of the LEA, the level of influence it enjoyed at LEA level and the degree of autonomy it had. He concluded that the most effective team, which he calls Orpheus, was one with low influence at LEA level, but high integration and high autonomy. This team was very much school centred and placed emphasis on the teacher involvement, high valuing of mutual respect and good relationships, emphasis on school self-assessment, encouraging teachers to stand on their own feet, make their own decisions, chair their own meetings and so on. The evidence suggested that this group knew the schools and visited more comprehensively than the advisers in the other authorities, were seen as more supportive and more competent by the teachers, who were more open to advisers and more prepared to accept advisers in a critical role. This authority had no chief inspector and advisers were left largely to their own devices, within general broad areas of policy.
By contrast, Zeus, a team which had its own chief inspector and was in a strong position managerially within the authority got into schools less often, had lower morale overall, had many schools which were scarcely known at all, were not very much involved in innovative activities, had less good INSET provision and were more critically viewed by teachers who felt that they had inadequate advisory support.

This is an interesting and somewhat disturbing conclusion in relation to the way in which advisory teams have developed since this study was undertaken. According to a survey by Dean (1991b) all authorities now have a chief adviser and as a result of the Education Reform Act which made much more specific demands on advisory services, they are much more organised. The day of the service left to its own devices is past so far as it is possible to tell.

What is not clear from Winkley’s study is the effectiveness of the teams in relation to the LEA itself, as distinct from the schools. It could be that teams which were less successful in schools were more successful in the office and with education committee members. There are also other possible reasons why the Orpheus team was more successful with the schools in addition to the levels of integration, influence and autonomy. The characteristics of the team members may have been important. There may have been natural leaders within the team who helped to develop a team culture and climate which placed emphasis on working with schools and on teacher autonomy. Team members may have experienced some training in their role - though this is probably unlikely given the period in which this study was undertaken. The particular organisation within the team in relation to specialist and general work may have affected what happened. They may have had a high ratio of advisers to schools. Undoubtedly the personality and views of the chief education officer in each case were relevant, particularly in teams without chief inspectors.

Dean (1984, p.9) gave a series of criteria for evaluating the work on an advisory team. They are as follows:

- the quality of relationships which advisers establish in the schools, not only in the head’s room but also in the teaching areas;
- the incidence of significant visits by advisers to schools;
- the extent to which advisers stimulate and help the members of each school staff to attain their professional aspirations for the school;
- the extent to which advisers help individual teachers to achieve their professional potential and aspirations;
- the effectiveness of the advisers in making known the needs of the schools to the authority so that appropriate resources are available, or so that the proper priorities are established;
- the quality of the help given by advisers in those areas in which they have special expertise;
- the extent to which advisers are able to give their specialist help within a general educational context;
- the extent to which advisers are able to comment effectively on broad educational issues beyond their special interests, and their ability to distinguish those topics on which specialist advice is necessary and those on which it is not;
- in general the extent to which advisers are fulfilling the teacher’s expectations of them;
- the extent to which advice given is seen to present a realistic target which is attainable by those schools in which it is given;
- the extent to which the advisory team looks after its own staff development and is seen to operate by the principles it advocates;
- the extent to which a climate of opinion is created which is favourable to the development of those curricula and methods which most clearly match the needs of the pupils for whom they are advocated.

Nixon and Rudduck (1992, pp.23,24) looked at the role of local authority advisers in inspection and at the criteria that six LEAs had developed to guide their teams in the inspection process. Their objective was to elicit the criteria for judgement which LEA advisers were using, to examine the ways in which the criteria were functioning within the inspection process and to consider whether these offered a coherent and consistent approach to local inspections.

They concluded that:

- local inspection is concerned primarily with the exercise of professional judgement, not with the measurement of school performance against predetermined norms and standards;
- professional judgement may operate with reference to explicit criteria, but these cannot themselves define - or circumscribe - a process which necessarily includes a strong tacit or inferential element;
- that element is currently what gives to local inspection its diagnostic edge and helps define its functions in terms of school improvements as well as public accountability.

These conclusions do not fit well with the future proposals for inspection which rely to a large extent on measurement of school performance against predetermined norms and tend to dispense with the idea that those who know the schools locally are the people who can most effectively make judgements about them. Nixon and Rudduck express considerable doubt about what is proposed. They question the possibility that the same inspection can provide for both the head and the school as customers and at the same time the governors and parents. They suggest that this tests the traditional notion of partnership upon which advisers have previously relied.

The Audit Commission (1989, pp.1, 15) suggested that there should be much stronger management of advisory teams with chief inspectors having the management of the team as their main task. They are also critical of the amount of observation of teaching by local authority advisers:

Currently the amount of observation of teaching by inspectors and advisers is uneven and in some LEAs disturbingly small. Recording of observations and record-keeping are usually unsystematic. Advisory work is not as positively managed as it needs to be. Support (staff, equipment and accommodation) for inspection and advisory services is often not matched to the tasks to be discharged.

They note that time spent observing teaching varied from 3% to over 60%. The average time advisers spent on inspection at the time of the report was 22%.
They listed the following matters for concern:

- poorly defined purposes and weak links with LEA priorities;
- lack of leadership and advisory service management, leaving advisers working in isolation, both from their colleagues and from the general purposes of the LEA;
- lack of leadership of advisory teachers by inspectors and advisers;
- inadequate monitoring with poor documentation

Bolam (1973) studied what happened to probationer teachers. He found that 33% of primary and 42% of secondary probationers responding to his study claimed that they had not been visited by an adviser during their first year. Advisers had responsibility for writing reports on probationers in 80% of LEAs and final responsibility for recommending the satisfactory completion of probation in 54% of LEAs. Sixty five per cent of probationers at the end of their first year did not know in what way their progress was being assessed and to whom and in what form their assessment would be reported. Only 22% had discussed their progress with an adviser.

Bolam et al (1978, p.73) studied the innovatory work of the advisory service. They reported an adviser as commenting:

I have to spend a disproportionate amount of time on probationers because I have so many. More time should be given to the cumulative evaluation of experienced staff - but not at the expense of the probationers, until there are other staff with time to devote to them.

They also noted and supported the common complaint of advisers about lack of clerical and other support in the office.

The study concluded that advisers adopted trainer, defender and conveyer roles in relation to educational innovation but rarely adopted consultancy roles. Their roles as trainers were largely on a multi-school basis and more emphasis was needed on follow up if they were to function effectively. They tended to start off innovations and then step back. Monitoring procedures were unsystematic and they tended to adopt certain schools and spend more time in them than others.

Her Majesty’s Inspectorate (HMI) (1988, pp.36 - 38), looking at the implementation of the Local Authority Training Grant Scheme (LEATGS) found that almost 90% of LEA provided in-service (INSET) sessions were judged to be satisfactory or better. The main weakness was the lack of follow up to provision. On the other hand:

there was a high regard for the contribution of advisory staff in the follow up to INSET. Teachers invariably reported that INSET had given them greater confidence to broaden their teaching approaches, to introduce new material and to work more closely with colleagues.

It was not only course-based INSET that was reported to have affected teaching and learning: visits by teachers to other schools; the support in the classroom of an adviser, colleague or advisory teacher; or cooperation with other schools were all considered by the schools to be important influences on classroom practice.
Of the forty three lessons observed where teaching and learning had been influenced by INSET, two thirds were judged to be of good quality and one sixth of outstanding quality. None of the remaining lessons were less than satisfactory.

Davies and Lyons (1976, p.9 and 1977) wrote of the clients of an advisory team and provided a framework of criteria for analysis of effectiveness. The articles also included an analysis of how well advisory teams met the criteria. The criteria included the following:

- the ability of the team to identify, interpret and respond to pressures from clients, including the local education authority;
- the existence of team goals and objectives stated as a phased development plan with defined objectives;
- the development of a repertoire of roles to build fruitful and appropriate helping relationships with clients;
- the integration of adviser effort into an effective team, and the creation of a favourable organisational climate in the team;
- the adequacy of support services;
- continued investment in the growth potential of the team, through a comprehensive framework of staff development.

Each of these criteria was accompanied by a set of questions which a team might use to assess its own effectiveness. There was also a set of comments about how well - or more generally - how badly, advisory teams measured up against these criteria. The evidence for this was not given, although the implication was that it was the authors’ experience.

Pearce (1986, p.204) suggested that the effectiveness of an advisory service might be judged in four ways:

- the degree of change over time in the quality of children’s learning;
- the rate at which objectionable classroom practice disappears;
- the depth and quality of teachers’ own engagement in the evolution of LEA policy;
- the level of awareness among teachers that the LEA is an agency with a positive interest in educational quality.

Humble (1989) looked at the support given to probationary teachers in a London borough. This was part of the work of advisers and his findings suggest that in his authority, the advisory service was not being very effective so far as this group of teachers was concerned. He surveyed all secondary school probationers by questionnaire and found that 87% had not been visited by the inspector for their subject and that 44% did not know their subject adviser. Thirty one per cent also said they had not met the school’s attached adviser. On the other hand 38% were impressed with the support they had received from the LEA, while 13% said they had received virtually no support. It is interesting to compare these findings with the much wider survey by Bolam described above.(cf. p.23)

There is, however, much in this study which could be criticised. There is no statement of research questions or hypothesis. The questionnaire tends to ask several questions at once.
and there is no indication about how it was compiled. Two questionnaires were sent out, one at the beginning of the year and one later, but as different people replied to the later one very little can reasonably be deduced about the way in which views had changed over the course of the year. The authority is a very small one and not very typical, in that it still has selection at eleven, but there is no discussion of this. There are also unsupported statements. For example, the writer concludes that the age level of probationers has risen, not on the basis of his study or any research into this subject, but because the government has been encouraging business men and women back to the classroom and attempting to draw on the pool of inactive teachers.

Stillman and Grant (1989, p.192) noted that their case studies suggested that advisers were ‘vastly overworked’. This must reflect upon the effectiveness with which they are able to work.

The effectiveness of advisory teachers
Advisory teachers are part of the advisory service but tend to work in rather different roles. Harland (1990, p.5) studied a group of advisory teachers in three local authorities and stressed that there was a good deal of variety in the tasks which they undertook. They fell into six categories:

- class teacher trainer - promotes teacher and curriculum development by working alongside teachers in their classroom;
- presenter - runs INSET sessions and workshops for teachers;
- researcher - surveys practice in schools in areas of curriculum or management;
- developer - of curriculum or related activities;
- coordinator of teams of advisory teachers;
- administrator for a specific task e.g. teaching requirements for GCSE.

The advisory teachers he studied nevertheless felt that there was a lack of a clear brief for their work and that even fairly basic requirements, such as desks and telephones were not properly organised when they were appointed. He raised the issue of how much autonomy should be given to advisory teachers and whether the fact that most of them are answerable to inspectors or advisers is the best way to organise them. Dean (1991b) found that some 30% of authorities had appointed a senior adviser to be in charge of advisory teachers overall and 4% had appointed a senior advisory teacher to take charge. This still required the advisory teacher to work closely with the inspector or adviser responsible for his or her specialism.

Harland also found that advisory teachers felt that they did not have sufficient contact with the rest of the advisory service. There was something of a transfer of functions taking place. As advisers became more involved in the inspection process and therefore had less time to work with classroom teachers this function was gradually being taken over by advisory teachers.
Biott (ed) (1991, p.88) found that advisory teachers typically spent 40% of the week in classrooms. He noted that advisory teachers' work was:

- often about creating new norms of practice within the host classrooms and schools. This is not an easy thing to do since all practice is nested within a matrix of assumptions about such things as the nature of knowledge, how children learn, what teaching involves and so on. ... What teachers do about learning in the classroom seems to be a function of what they think about learning in the classroom. ... Consequently any work with teachers directed towards transformative learning may involve helping the class teacher to:
  - explore, clarify and "make sense" of existing practices and value systems (otherwise the limitations of these may not be realised);
  - replace the set of understandings or meanings which underpin existing practices with a new set of understandings or meanings which can guide the development of new practices;
  - try out and become confident in new practices (and the concomitant value systems)

Biott also found that advisory teachers had problems because there was no clearly defined career structure and that there were problems for them in returning to work in schools. (cf. Harland, p.26)

Newhofer et al (1992, p.68) suggested that there were 4 crucial contributions an advisory teacher can make:

- to facilitate teachers' learning from one another's theories and practices - through meetings, courses, networks, visiting, cooperative projects and so on;
- to facilitate teachers' learning from pupils about how the curriculum is experienced - through leading sessions with pupils so that their perceptions can be matched against teachers' and through sharing teaching, research enquiry, interviewing and so on;
- to help teachers publish statements about their work;
- to enable teachers to help determine policy - inviting teachers, or recommending that they be invited, onto the outside so that correspondence is achieved between what is stated about the curriculum and what actually happens within it.

Lofthouse (1987) described how there was an influx of advisory teachers from Government initiated Education Support Grants (ESGs) in the late 1980s. Advisory teachers were appointed particularly for science, mathematics and information technology.

Lofthouse was writing in 1987, when this development was very new and she suggested that the breadth of experience of those being appointed was likely to be limited since they were recruited simply on the basis of being good classroom teachers. She also noted that some local education authorities were not as well prepared for this influx as others and schools did not always have a clear idea of what the advisory teachers were to do or whether they were inspectors in disguise. She suggested that there should be a post of curriculum advisory inspector for primary schools who would be recruited from primary school headteachers and would undertake curriculum development in a group of schools but would not be buried under the multitude of other tasks which beset existing advisers. In the event some authorities recruited advisory headteachers with this type of role (e.g. Surrey, Berkshire)
HMI (1988, p.12) described advisory teachers as:

highly motivated, hard working and in some cases, inspirational in their teaching and support of schools. This role requires tact and diplomacy as well as a thorough knowledge of the field; all these qualities were apparent. Schools visited by HMI had a high regard for the contribution of advisory teachers in the provision of INSET and more particularly in the follow up to a wide range of provision.

Stillman and Grant (1989, pp.89,90) noted that there was a broadening in the role of advisory teachers and recorded the following comments from chief advisers:

- Advisory teachers have had to become more autonomous in areas where there are no advisers.
- Their role has become more important as Soulbury advisers have less time.
- They are being drawn into appointments.
- They are more involved in trouble-shooting.
- There is a tendency to move away from classroom-based work into INSET and advisory work.
- In future the role will be broadened possibly to include (responsibility for) probationers and evaluation with closer management.
- The use of advisory teachers is moving advisers to more generalist role,

Harland (1990, p.44,45) noted that the advisory teachers in his study appear to have offered in-service activities which produced numerous positive effects in classrooms and which were widely appreciated. They were seen as valuable in spreading ideas gleaned from other schools.

The advisory teachers in Harland’s study had 4 concerns about strategies for ensuring long term effects:

- The problem of sustaining developments after they had left the school. Planned review visits were often a casualty of pressures. There was a need for work on planning how the school could support follow up.
- The need to provide for continuity of advisory teacher contacts and developments. Advisory teachers might form good relationships with a school but had difficulty in maintaining them and were concerned about what happened when they left.
- The need to ensure that the impact of an advisory teacher’s input was spread and embedded across several staff. This was more likely to continue if several staff had been involved.
- The need to sequence and coordinate participation in in-service activities in order that teachers experienced them as a coherent provision.

He cited the problem of the appointment of advisory teachers and the extent to which they should be appointed on secondment for a period of one, two or three years or permanently. Seconded teachers were regarded as being effective partly because teachers were more likely to give credibility to someone who had recently been a full time practitioner and they brought a variety of fresh experience to the school. The experience of being an advisory teacher was also good for the development of the individuals concerned. However, there appeared to be a problem of re-entry, with advisory teachers finding difficulty in getting promotion within the school system and a concern on their part that the new skills they had developed would not be used.
Harland (1990) gave a list of some of the factors which affected the extent to which an advisory teacher could be effective. These included the enthusiasm and skills of the advisory teacher, his or her credibility as a recent practitioner and the reputation which he or she had built up. Effective management of advisory teacher teams and the length and frequency of their inputs in a school were also important. They needed the capacity to sustain in-service support and curriculum development and an ability to identify and diagnose needs. It was likely that their work would be more effective if they had the chance to talk to teachers in some depth before and after any work in the classroom.

Matthews (1990) studied the work of advisory teachers, whom he saw primarily as change agents achieving change both through their work in the classroom and through in-service work both school-focused and more general. He used questionnaires and then interviewed very small groups of inspectors and advisory teachers and surveyed the views of headteachers probably within one borough authority although this is not stated. His findings, though interesting, are of value only as statements made by individuals, because of the small size of samples and because he gives no information about how the samples were selected. The results are also set out in tables which are unexplained and are not clear to the reader as they stand. There are, nevertheless, many interesting points made and some are confirmed by other studies (e.g. Harland 1990).

He found that among the advisory teachers, only a few thought that their previous experience had equipped them as change agents. They tended to rely too much on the opinions of senior management in schools as a means of assessing the needs of teachers for in-service work and support and few used evidence which might be gained from observing teachers and talking with pupils. He was conscious that the organisation of any school, its climate and culture affected the ability of teachers to take from any training opportunities offered but found that the sample of advisory teachers were not aware of this. Few of them appeared to have a clear rationale for their ways of working. He found that the predominant model for working with teachers was that of ‘collaborative control’ in which teacher and advisory teacher shared the class. Advisory teachers tended not to consider a variety of ways of working and select those which seemed appropriate for the task in hand. They also used a very limited range of methods used for evaluating their work, mainly talking with the teacher and questioning the children or giving them questionnaires.

There was also concern and critical comment from headteachers about the advisory teachers’ lack of information about current developments both within the LEA and elsewhere. This confirmed the finding of Harland (1990) that advisory teachers found communication within the LEA a problem.

Straker (1988, pp.379,381) found advisory teachers concerned about their future
prospects and also about the fact that there was no way of measuring success in the work they were doing. However, this came from a very small sample of 3 teachers. One of the 3 who had undertaken intensive work in a small number of schools made the following statement:

I think that we have had a great influence in the schools we have worked in. The teachers and the heads have told us so. Our range of schools has been restricted and there has been no determined effort to widen the range. I do think we have had to work hard to earn credibility and win the confidence of teachers.

He went on to describe the project being undertaken and the outcomes. There was a general feeling among the teachers and headteachers involved in the project that it had been successful. This was summed up by one middle school headteacher as follows:

The catalytic effect of the project has been valuable. Teachers are now beginning to change styles. It’s a slow process but, nevertheless, things are moving and there is no doubt that this is due to this project. The mode of operating is ideal and the work in maths has now expanded beyond their (advisory teachers) immediate input.

Whitaker (1990a, p.3) reported on a survey of the work of advisory teachers made by the Centre for Adviser and Inspector Development (CAID). The findings were as follows:

- Advisory teachers bring relevant, recent and successful classroom experience to their work. This gives them a high level of credibility with teachers;
- They have been recruited for their high quality classroom skills and experience;
- They are more able than advisers and inspectors to spend time with individual teachers, helping them to reflect on their experience and build classroom practice in significant ways;
- They are the nearest the education service comes to providing a genuine consultancy service. They have more time available for this process than advisers and inspectors and less vested interest in the outcomes;
- They are less identified with the LEA’s central bureaucracy and decision-making processes than advisers and inspectors;
- Where they work with a special group of schools they have the capacity to become more ‘insider’ oriented and this helps to bring trust and acceptance;
- They are often safety valves, confidants and counsellors;
- They are spreaders of good practice, being able to transfer good practice from one classroom to another;
- They are conduits and catalysts for new ideas. Each advisory teachers is a personal database of ideas and practices;
- They help teachers directly by working alongside them. This is particularly important where new approaches are being implemented and early teething troubles can cause frustration and despair.

Whitaker (1990a) suggested that advisory teachers were likely to take on some of the work which advisers, in changing their role, no longer had time to do. In particular they were likely to be more involved in curriculum development and in-service work. This might be deliberate and planned or it might lead to role confusion.

Stillman and Grant (1989) found that there were 3000 advisory teachers in post (p.39) and that the number was still growing. Dean (1991b) surveying the scene two years later found that the number was more than 4087, but that in many authorities financial stringencies were leading to cuts in numbers. (The difference in numbers may be partly accounted for by the
fact that Stillman and Grant’s study had a return of 55% compared with a return of 86% for Dean’s study.) This study listed the specialisms held by advisory teachers and found that while the majority were appointed to deal with the foundation subjects of the National Curriculum, there were altogether some 93 different specialisms.

**Effectiveness in schools**

Recent years have seen considerable work both here in defining the characteristics of an effective school, for example, Bennett *et al*, (1976), Galton *et al*, (1980a and 1980b), Rutter *et al*, (1979); Mortimore *et al*, (1988); Alexander *et al*, (1989) and in America, Denham and Lieberman, (1980); Little, (1982); Clark and McCarthy, (1983); Purkey and Smith, (1985); Witto and Walsh, (1990); Fullan and Stiegelbauer, (1991) and many others. This has relevance for the advisory service in two ways. If the service is to be effective, it must aim to help schools to become effective. It is therefore important for advisers to be aware of what is known about effectiveness and schools. It is also probable that much that applies to schools in terms of effectiveness, also applies to advisory services.

Much work in the last 20 years, notably that of Rutter *et al* (1979) and Mortimore *et al* (1988) in this country and many writers in the America, has demonstrated that school makes a difference and that children of similar background and ability achieve differently according to the school that they attend.

Purkey and Smith (1985, pp.358,359,263) noted that research into school effectiveness had changed from a study of quantitative measures such as class size to qualitative studies of processes, from large scale surveys to in-depth observations and interviews in a smaller number of schools. In a review of research they list the following as factors which have been found to be characteristic of effective schools:

- school site management and democratic decision making;
- leadership;
- staff stability;
- curriculum articulation and organisation;
- staff development;
- parental involvement and support;
- schoolwide recognition of academic success;
- maximised learning time;
- district support;
- collaborative planning and collegial relationships;
- clear goals and high expectations commonly shared;
- order and discipline.

They made the point which was highly relevant for advisory teams that if people were to change, they must be genuinely involved in making the decisions concerning the changes. If people were to be accountable for change and for the outcomes of change, they must participate in designing and implementing the changes.
They stressed that the school was the focus of change and that changes in other parts of the education service must be evaluated in the light of their influence on the culture and climate of the school.

They suggested that influencing part of the school was not sufficient. There must be influence on the whole school culture if effectiveness was to be increased. They noted that:

visible support from the district office, material and moral, is essential to the school improvement process. Teachers and principals are unlikely to put forth the effort required to change established patterns of practice unless they feel recognised, supported and rewarded by the district administration.

Reid et al (1987) in the preface to their book *Towards the effective school* made the following statement:

Literature is in agreement that positive features of effective schools are to do with process-type manifestations of schooling such as strong leadership, high expectations, a clear set of goals, school-wide staff training and efficient systems for monitoring pupils, rather than extraneous aspects like the age of the school buildings and teachers' salaries.

Literature also agrees that all these factors are amenable to alteration by concerted action on the part of the school staff.

This statement could equally well apply to advisory services who also need strong leadership, high expectations, a clear set of goals, good training and effective systems for monitoring schools.

Virtually all studies of effectiveness stress the importance of leadership. The head of a school is in a key position regarding the effectiveness of the school. Advisers need to be aware of this in working with headteachers. Much that is said about effective headteachers also applies to chief advisers who are in a very similar role. Purkey and Smith (1985, p.370) noted than in a secondary school curricular leadership also comes from heads of department. They also noted that effective leaders:

encourage individuals to find better ways of doing things, ... get increasing numbers of people involved in making change happen and ... promote collaborative teams that serve as vehicles for reform.

Finlayson (1973) described a study which produced behaviour scales for for headteachers and heads of department which listed among other things problem orientation, professional and personal concern for staff, openness and friendliness. All of these might well be applied to the behaviour of chief advisers and senior members of the advisory team.

Mortimore and his colleagues (1988) studied fifty inner London schools with juniors on roll. They found that the headteacher’s time in the present post was important. The most effective heads appeared to have been in post between three and eleven years. Change or instability in the management structure of the school was negatively associated with pupils'
progress and development. Where the head gave positive leadership in curriculum matters by attempting to influence teachers this affected children’s progress positively. The involvement of the deputy head and teaching staff in decision-making was another important characteristic of effective leadership by the head.

Reid et al (1987) also reviewed researches about the effective headteacher or principal and found that he or she set a strong managerial example, recruited his or her own staff, was fully supportive of teachers, provided a structure in which teachers could function effectively, achieved high levels of parent contact, created a good balance between strong leadership and autonomy for teachers, gave strong instructional leadership and was a firm disciplinarian.

Bruss (1986, p.198,199) stressed the need for leaders to know the processes for changing instructional behaviour. The article referred to principals of schools and other school leaders but was equally applicable to advisers. The article described a project known as Effective Teaching and Supervision of Instruction (ETSI). The intent was ‘to move schools towards a professional development plan for their supervisors of instruction and their teachers that will provide training for the entire staff over a period of years’. It was based on the view that teaching was a performance behaviour which could best be improved through an analysis of that behaviour and the emphasis was on developing instructional leaders in individual schools. The programme included the following factors:

- the principal is schooled in the knowledge of effective teaching skills;
- instructional leaders other than the principal are identified and trained;
- the programme includes presentation of theory, demonstration, practice and feedback and coaching;
- the instructional program(me) links new knowledge and skills to teachers’ prior experiences;
- teacher-administrator (manager) harmony is developed through joint participation in the program(me)s

Purkey and Smith (1985) set out guidelines for the local superintendent which have some relevance for local advisory teams as they are at present. It remains to be seen whether the points they make will be relevant in the future. If they are not this would suggest a weakness in the system if these writers are correct in their diagnosis. They suggested that there were four key tasks for someone in the role of superintendent. These were to establish guidelines for school improvement; specify goals after getting input from relevant parties; ensure that a school improvement plan had been designed and implemented and prescribe a timeline for the project, although they recognised that the timing would vary from school to school. It could be argued that the making of school development plans already goes some way towards this. Advisory teams also need development plans.

District staff also needed to be involved in negotiation and consultation about plans and ensure accountability. Purkey and Smith suggested that the community should be involved in the process of making goals at the school level. In addition schools must have some means
of measuring change and evaluating how far they have come. The choice of evaluation tools should affect the original choice of goals.

They also suggested that that staff development should come through working together to make the school more effective rather than through a deficit model of staff development. There should also be access to curriculum specialists and consultants.

Clark and McCarthy (1983, p.17) described the work on school improvement in New York. This was of interest in that it described work very much like that of advisers, particularly that of the advisory team who undertook the Leeds study reported in Alexander, Willcocks and Kinder (1989). The New York study was based on six factors which research has shown to characterise effective schools:

- strong administrative leadership (in American terms this refers to management by the head of the school);
- orderly school climate;
- emphasis on basic skills acquisition;
- high expectations for student achievement;
- monitoring of student progress.

The experience of this program(me) reinforced the view that principals were not prepared for the content and process of change of their expected roles in instructional leadership.

This approach contrasts with the Leeds School Improvement Project (Alexander et al, 1989) where the work was apparently less based on theory about effective schools and more concerned with effectiveness as viewed by the local advisory team. The funding of this project appears to have been generous and an individual known as a ‘liaison’ was allocated to every school in the first cohort. Later the liaison was expected to take on two and then three schools. This post would seem to be something like that of an advisory teacher with responsibility to get the project work off the ground in each school, helping schools to identify their needs and build school development plans to meet five factors of effectiveness. There was emphasis on the need to build trust in the liaison in each case and this was also something emphasised by respondents to the initial survey in this study.

The most successful aspect of this study appears to have been in the development of reading, where the project schools had done substantially better than those in the rest of the city. Unfortunately the writers stated that it was not possible to discover whether the improvement was significant which seems strange in a project of this importance. The writers of the report were critical of the work that was done in that they felt it was not sufficiently focussed to be effective.
of the sample. The six schools chosen included three primary and three secondary, each with a different pattern of success as measured by local testing and teacher involvement in inservice education. Every school was therefore different and a different sample might have produced different results.

This study had a political importance out of proportion to its size. It was seized on by politicians as evidence that what are sometimes called 'progressive primary methods' do not work and the implication was that advisers had been leading schools in the wrong direction. It could be that the decision to privatise the inspection system and to do this by cutting down the local advisory service was related to the way this study was viewed. It was significant that the one of the writers of this report became one of the '3 wise men' who produced a report on primary education for the Department of Education and Science (1992) which was intended by the politicians and interpreted by the press as suggesting that we turn back the clock in primary education but which actually said that teachers should match method to children and purpose.

Murphy et al (1985, p.364) looked at the various characteristics of effective schools with a view to discovering which ones were invariably present and which were present in some schools but not others. Their sample consisted of 9 schools with varied backgrounds. They concluded that all effective schools had what is called by some researchers 'a tightly coupled curriculum' by which they meant a curriculum in which the curricular materials employed, the instructional approaches used and the assessment instruments selected were all tightly aligned with the basic learning objectives for the students. They may also be characterised by opportunity to learn which was described as 'allocated and engaged time, content covered and success rate'. There was tight monitoring of individual student work and a climate of high expectation, but this might come from staff or parents. In fact a major finding was that different effective schools have different combinations of the characteristics of effective schools. This article does not give enough information about the study concerned to be able to judge its validity. The sample was a comparatively small one and the method of selection was not clearly described. There was also no account of the methodology by which the conclusions were reached.

Pink (1984) made the point that much of the effective schools' literature omits to consider the effect on students of the way the school treats them. Teachers tended to separate students at an early stage into those who were academically successful and those who were not and they tended to be treated accordingly, often being placed in ability groups from which there was little movement. This limited not only their likelihood of succeeding in school but also their life chances. As a result some began to reject the values of the school and become troublesome. If unsuccessful schools were to become successful it was essential that they took
this problem into consideration. Similar points were made by Hargreaves (1982).

Reid et al (1987) made the point that the effective school was one which used reflection for a purpose. Advisers too need to be reflective about their work.

Rutter and his colleagues (1979) looked at twelve secondary schools in inner London chosen mainly because many of their children had been part of a survey in the contributory primary schools and this gave information about what they were like immediately prior to transfer. The criteria by which they made judgements of schools involved measures of the individual characteristics of pupils entering the schools; the social organisation of schools and the types of environments for learning which they provided for pupils; the outcomes of schooling for these pupils, which included the children’s behaviour in school, attendance, examination success, employment and delinquency. Their findings about effective schools suggest that there was a difference between the performance of pupils in the different schools which persisted after social differences had been accounted for. The style and quality of life at school affected children’s behaviour. All actions which showed pupils that they were to be trusted to behave in a mature manner were likely to encourage pupils to fulfil those expectations e.g. giving responsibilities, expecting pupils to look after their own resources and so on. Pupils were more likely to accept school norms when there were shared activities between staff and pupils, pupil positions of responsibility within the school system and success and achievement. Pupil outcomes tended to be better where the schools provided pleasant working conditions. Behaviour was better where teachers were readily available to be consulted about problems. Outcomes tended to be less good for all pupils if the school had a high proportion of less able children.

Mortimore et al (1988) found that juniors only schools were less likely to be associated with higher levels of progress than those which catered for pupils from five to eleven. The physical environment of the building was related positively to children’s progress in writing. There was a positive impact where teachers were encouraged to go on courses for a good reason. There was a negative finding where teachers were encouraged to go on any course. Where heads said they laid particular emphasis on basic skills, the impact on pupils’ progress was negative. Where punishment rather than reward was emphasised pupils’ progress tended to be inhibited. Where the emphasis was on rewards the effect was positive. The use of stars and certificates was particularly beneficial. Parental involvement in the classroom, other kinds of parental assistance, progress meetings with parents to discuss their children’s work all had a positive effect.

Reid et al (1987) listed research findings which were associated with effective teaching in the classroom. They included positive leadership from a group of teachers that included sharing responsibility for decision-making and implementation; teacher accountability for
student performance and the provision of accurate information on that performance; on-going in-service training related to the instructional programme; in-service programmes on topics determined by teachers, together with frequent informal consultations among teachers in implementing reading programmes; teachers' strong sense of efficacy and high expectations for students; teacher flexibility in modifying and adapting instructional approaches; reduced teacher-pupil ratios; cohesiveness amongst teachers; demonstrated concern for individual and group student welfare and positive teacher expectations for all pupils.

Witto and Walsh (1990) described a large scale research on effective schools in the schools of Milwaukee. The achievement measures involved standardised test data in mathematics and reading and the major instrument used was a substantial postal survey of teachers asking for their view of key measures of the school environment. The study also included an analysis of the effects of parental involvement and variation in teacher involvement in key decision-making. The idea behind the research was to see if the findings of the many smaller studies of effectiveness would be supported in a much larger study.

In the event there were many problems and the results led the researchers to question whether the attempts that were being made to use the results of research into effectiveness were likely to give results in the classroom. Their main findings were that the location of the school and its student population very much affected the outcome. In particular they found that magnet schools had good results but they questioned the effect that the existence of these schools had on other schools. They also found that parental involvement had a positive effect on student achievement, and that teacher involvement in decision making was also significant.

The size and scope of this study meant that there was less opportunity for the kind of detailed investigation of the much smaller samples of schools given in the work of Rutter and Mortimore where it was possible to look at a larger number of variables and in particular to study what went on in classrooms.

Purkey and Smith (1985, p.354) also make the following point which is extremely relevant to advisory staff at the present time:

"How can teachers and school administrators (headteachers and other senior staff) be invested with a feeling of ownership and commitment to mandates for school improvement that originate outside of the school?"

They suggested that effective change was more likely to be achieved by 'bottom up' reforms than by those coming from the top down.

Department of Education and Science (DES) Circular 7/88 stated that LEAs would need to develop performance indicators for the financial and wider management functions of governing bodies based on indicators used by the schools themselves.
The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) (1988, p.4) outlined a context for performance indicators for schools which local authorities could use in making judgements. They suggested that these would have to be:

- related to the schools own aims and objectives;
- reliable as far as possible and able to be standardised;
- as few as are needed to achieve their purpose;
- as acceptable as possible to those who use them;
- capable of conveying messages and throwing up warning signs.

Broomhead (1982, pp.15 - 17) suggested that performance indicators could be:

- general descriptions in narrative or report form;
- ratings based on judgemental scales;
- comparisons of achievements against time;
- ratios relating inputs to outputs or present performance to an index of past performance;
- direct counts of financial expenditure.

He saw performance indicators in the context of the management of performance where the broad objectives were to:

- provide an objective, fair and equitable performance appraisal for all employees;
- establish a clear understanding of the results expected, measurement criteria, measurement standards, goals and performance levels expected for all jobs in the organisation;
- provide accurate, objective and timely feedback to employees about performance on the job;
- permit employee participation in setting goals and review of performance.

Arnold and Carter (1990, pp.4 - 21) surveyed what a number of different LEAs were doing about performance indicators. The overall list included the following:

- Staff participation in INSET; pupil participation in work experience; community links; pupil achievement; staying on rate; parental involvement; pupils' attitudes; continuity, progression, equal opportunities; examination results; attendance; pupil behaviour; entry into further education and employment; financial management; school management; management of learning; ratio of teaching to ancillary staff; average time posts are vacant; percentage of teaching staff absent through illness; number and length of staff meetings; senior management team meetings; governors' meetings; number of parents' meetings; attendance as proportion of possible attendance; number of school activities e.g. concerts and sports' days; number of adults given access to lessons as proportion of pupils on roll; resources; buildings and grounds; costs per pupil; school development plans; qualifications of staff; deployment of non-teaching staff; pupils' engagement in the learning process; evidence of understanding.

The role and function of the advisory service

The advisory service for the purpose of this study is defined as including inspectors, advisers and advisory teachers whatever their particular title. The roles of these officers will vary from one authority to another but there is much in common. A paper by the National Association of Inspectors and Educational Advisers (NAIEA) (1988, p.1) published at the time of the
Education Reform Act listed the following as the major activities which advisory services would be required to perform under the new legislation:

- inspection in all its forms;
- management, development and evaluation of the Grant Related In-Service Training (GRIST) and Education Support Grant (ESG) programmes;
- curriculum support and development, particularly for provision within the National Curriculum;
- management of programmes for the development of appraisal for headteachers and other staff;
- development, organisation and moderation of national assessment systems;
- management of staff in relation to curriculum planning, resources management, financial personnel duties, management of change;
- training of governors and advice to governing bodies;

Rhodes (1981) suggested that the major difference between LEA advisers and HMI was that the former were responsible for the schools they inspected and advised. However, he felt that there was an overlap. Teachers saw HMI as clearly independent of the LEA and they saw them less frequently than LEA advisers. They saw their advice as being objective whereas there was a suspicion that a teacher’s response to the advice offered by the LEA adviser might affect his chances of promotion. LEA advisers had to deal with local problems such as complaints by parents, poor staff relationships or inadequate headteachers.

Kogan (1974, p.2) suggested that an important characteristic of advice given by advisers, was that teachers, as professionals receiving advice from another group of professionals, could take it or leave it. The same was true of in-service education. Advice, nevertheless, while having no prescriptive authority, was likely to be influential.

He defined as an inspector, ‘someone who has authority and is accountable for the assessment of performance on behalf of some management or authority system’. He cited the judgements made about probationary teachers and teachers who were candidates for promotion as examples of activity in the inspectorial role which had a prescriptive element which was absent from the advisory role. He also noted that there was an administrative function and he questioned whether it was possible for one and the same person to carry out all 3 roles. However, he suggested that to double the numbers and separate the roles would not be feasible and that the only thing to do was to recognise the ambiguities.

Nash (1989, p.8) pointed out that ‘no one knew which side advisory staff are on’ Were they the foot soldiers of the local education authority and educational policy makers or ‘messengers of woe from under-resourced schools?’ This has been a problem for advisory staffs for almost as long as they have existed.

The Taylor report (1977, p.57) made the following statement about advisers:

The purpose of the advisory service is to promote high standards of performance by teachers and of attainment by pupils both in basic skills and studies and in education in its wider sense. This purpose is principally achieved through the provision of advice based on a wide experience and knowledge, to head and other teachers and by reference to example to show where and how high standards are achieved and maintained.
Lavelle (1984) in a discussion of the role of consultancy in organisation development, suggested that advisers could not be consultants. The adviser operated as an agent of curriculum development. The consultant's role was client-initiated and the relationship was a temporary one and task specific. It was entirely advisory and there was no administrative relationship. The present study suggests that schools would like the advisory service to be more of a consultancy service. This means a considerable change in the way advisory services have been operating.

Mason (1991, p.9) by contrast, described how Northamptonshire was developing a consultancy approach based on two specially formed management consultancy teams. The teams were formed to include complementary expertise and included 3 members, a general inspector, a seconded headteacher and a deputy head/senior teacher. The teams were specially trained in consultancy before commencing work. They then offered schools their services to help them to deal with issues identified by each institution. Mason suggested that 'the secondment of inspectors to such an advisory/consultancy function has the attraction of providing schools with support based upon a secure partnership with the LEA but separated from the processes of inspection and accountability.'

Stillman and Grant (1989) studied the current state of advisory services across the country obtaining replies from 55.1% of advisers. At that stage there were 101 advisers per 1000 schools, on average 10.1 schools per adviser. There were, however, enormous differences between the staffing of different authorities ranging from 244 advisers per 1000 schools (4.1 schools per adviser) to 36 advisers per 100 schools (27.8 schools per adviser). The ratios for advisory teachers were similar. They found that ratios were considerably more favourable in metropolitan boroughs than in counties.

Only 16.5% of advisers described themselves as subject specialists solely; 6.4% described themselves as 'pure' phase specialists and 3.6% as solely general advisers. Pastoral responsibilities were held by 67.8% each of whom had responsibility for a group of schools.

Nebesnuick (1991) looked at advisory services after the Education Reform Act. During the period between 1988 and mid 1990 advisory services had increased by 20%. Eighty four per cent of those surveyed (53 authorities) had reorganised their teams. This was more true for those authorities south of a line from the Wash to the Bristol Channel. There was a change from a 'flatarchy' to a hierarchy in many authorities, an increase in link advisers, a shift from specialist to general work, a move to an area basis for work with area team leaders, some increase in primary teams and post sixteen teams, increased emphasis on monitoring and inspection and the inclusion of some officers in the monitoring teams, an extension of subject coverage to include all National Curriculum subjects and the work had become more structured with more systematic information gathering.
McQuarrie and Wood (1992, p.92) wrote about the supervision of teachers in North America, a task which appeared to have much in common with the work of advisers in Britain. They suggested that there was a tendency to produce 'one-shot' in-service courses for the district and to fail to address the supervisory activities 'to ensure that what is learned transferred to the classroom.' There was a tendency to focus supervision on teachers having difficulty whereas it was actually needed by all teachers if classroom practice was to be improved.

**Advisers and the management of change**

Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991, pp.29,191) made a very apposite statement about politically motivated change:

> Politically motivated change is accompanied by greater commitment of leaders, the power of new ideas and additional resources; but it also produces overload, unrealistic time-lines, uncoordinated demands, simplistic solutions, misdirected effort and under-estimation of what it takes to bring about reform.

Fullan and Stiegelbauer stressed how complex a process change really is. They pointed out that real change involves change in concepts and role behaviour, which is why it was so difficult to achieve. They noted that change appears to be good if it accords with one's values. The fact that much of the change being implemented at the present time does not accord with the values of advisers and teachers increases the difficulty of implementing it successfully. The present study has demonstrated very clearly how unhappy many advisers are with the proposed changes in their role.

Although Fullan and Stiegelbauer wrote from the Canadian point of view they spoke of the need for teacher support from central administration and they were clearly thinking of support of a similar kind to that given by advisers in Britain. They pointed out:

> The district administrator is the single most important individual for setting the expectation and tone of the pattern of change within the local district.

While it is possible that an administrator in our sense of the word might be a good change agent, the existence of advisers means that this kind of role is likely to be taken by the advisory service. Fullan and Stiegelbauer spoke of the need for district staff to determine the need for change, ensuring that support of various kinds was provided and monitoring the progress of the changes. External facilitators made people aware of new practices, helped them to choose between alternatives those that matched the school's needs, arranged for and conducted training and helped to plan and implement continued support.

Richardson (1990) suggested that teachers were more likely to accept change when it
was practical in terms of the classroom, fitted their own classroom situation and could be afforded. She suggested that reflection on classroom experience was an important part of teacher learning. She also noted that teachers’ beliefs, ideas and experience affected their attitudes to change.

Bolam et al (1978, pp.78,170,98) undertook a study ‘to explore the role of advisers in the infra-structure of external support for schools engaged in maintaining and improving their educational policies.’ There were three main aims to this work. They set out to look at the innovative aspects of the work of LEA advisers, to relate these to their overall function and then to identify some of their principal training needs.’

Their respondents noted the need for regular visits to schools to identify individual strengths and weaknesses and establish good personal relationships. They thought the best opportunities for developing the work of teachers were with the individual teacher in the classroom but found this very time-consuming and therefore spent time with teachers in working party groups and in-service courses.

The respondents noted the difficulty of getting change:

(The) difficulty (in getting change) is fundamentally changing attitudes. Apparatus, furniture, class materials can be supplied, schemes of work changed, but unless there is a change of fundamental philosophy, it’s all a bit wasted.

At this time many advisers had at their disposal sums of money to support work in schools. These varied from £25 to £1,000,000. Many respondents felt that this was an important factor in making them effective in their work, but there was also a view that teachers found it difficult to reject the advice offered because it came with additional money. In the case studies given the existence of additional funds was crucial to the success of the projects. One respondent commented:

Where the strategy is used (of giving additional funds) the impact of the financial support may be quite disproportionate to its cost since the provision of relatively small amounts may be vital for a significant innovation or may legitimise a project which is then able to raise the rest of the funds required.

The study was concerned with advisers as innovators. They found that 82% of advisers saw themselves in this role but only 28% functioned in the role to a great extent. Sixty four per cent would have liked to do more in this role. There was a certain amount of difficulty in working as an innovator. The basic problems were the lack of resources, particularly advisers’ and teachers’ time, the problem of teacher release, lack of equipment, lack of venues for meeting, travelling problems and lack of finance. A respondent commented:

There is a limit to the number of projects - whether national or local - in which schools can be engaged, especially if this means releasing staff. Some teachers already feel harassed when assaulted with so many new ideas.
Bolam et al also saw other difficulties. Advisers in some sense had to face in two directions - towards the schools in one direction and towards the office in the other. This could result in their being seen by both teachers and administrators as marginal figures who offered idealistic solutions to problems which were not their central concern. The attempt to give equal priority to both the schools and the office produced intolerable strain.

The role of advisers as change agents has changed considerably since Bolam et al (1978) studied advisers as innovators. Bolam found advisers both developing projects from bodies such as the Schools’ Council and also projects of their own devising. The present study shows today’s advisers concerned mainly with the development of work related to the National Curriculum and assessment and with appraisal. There is very little opportunity for advisers to foster developments outside the areas receiving national attention which they think would be beneficial to the schools and if such projects were introduced, they are unlikely to be taken up by teachers who are fully occupied with national developments.

Whale and Ribbins (1990) described the way in which the City of Birmingham had set up evaluation in their further education colleges who were sceptical of the capacity of outsiders, with limited time and access, either to interpret their snapshot findings in context or to offer informed advice about how to improve service delivery. They therefore set up training for college staff in evaluation theory and practice, offered to provide a coordinating function for evaluation findings and made a contract with each college to provide additional fundings if the college committed itself to a range of formative and summative evaluation exercises. This worked successfully in that it stimulated a critical approach and the development of analytical skills and the authority at that time planned to extend the programme to schools, replacing inspection on the grounds that it was inefficient, ineffective and of doubtful validity!

Overall the literature, with some exceptions, does not give a very favourable view of the advisory service, whether advisers and inspectors or advisory teachers. It also brings out the many difficulties under which the service works. Until recently it tended to lack leadership, was staffed at a level too low to undertake the many tasks expected of it and lacked the support of secretarial help and good office accommodation. The Education Reform Act produced an increase in staffing and better leadership and organisation but possibly not a great deal of improvement in support services. It remains to be seen whether the effect of competition and the need to sell services to schools will result in any improvement. Since this will be taking place in the context of reduced numbers and a need to spend a great deal of time inspecting schools and dealing with the appraisal of headteachers, this seems unlikely.
3 IN SEARCH OF EFFECTIVENESS IN THE ADVISORY SERVICE

Introduction

What is meant by 'effective'?

In the context described in chapter 1 advisory services are likely to remain employed by schools only if the services they provide are known to be effective. This study sets out to consider the extent to which aspects of advisory work are currently seen to be effective and what factors might make the work more effective.

The word effective is defined by the Concise Oxford dictionary as 'actual, existing in fact rather than theoretically' 'actually usable, realisable'. These are definitions which would be likely to be accepted by teachers. For example, one teacher in the study, speaking of what she would like from the advisory service made this comment:

I think practical ideas you can use in the classroom, good resources, things that actually work in the classroom and sort of lesson strategies and the organisational aspect.

*Primary school teacher, authority A*

Another teacher, talking about the effective adviser, said:

I think it's got to be someone who relates to your normal, everyday teaching practice. Sometimes you can feel 'Yes that's all very well, but would it work in the real world' I think they have got to be clear that they are thinking of the practical daily thirty five children as well.

*Primary school teacher, authority A*

There is a considerable problem in assessing effectiveness in the advisory service. If one is looking at the effectiveness of a factory making shoes, effectiveness can be judged by the number of pairs of shoes completed and sold in relation to the cost of making them. Judging effectiveness in teachers is more difficult because they start with groups of pupils who may be at a wide variety of stages of learning. To make judgments about how well a teacher is doing one really needs to know the starting point in terms of pupils' knowledge and skill in order to be able to judge the value that has been added by the teaching which has gone on. It is, nevertheless, possible to make such judgments where the criteria are clearly defined.

When we come to making judgments about the effectiveness of advisers the problem is very much more difficult. One can never be sure of the extent to which a school or a teacher develops work as the result of work by an adviser and how far the work might have developed anyway. It is also difficult to know whether work by an adviser which helps to improve the management of a school actually affects the work pupils do in the classroom. If we add to that the fact that good advisory work involves making people feel that they did it themselves it can be seen that judging advisory effectiveness is a very difficult task.
On the other hand, teachers and headteachers have a good idea of whether they think their local advisory service is effective or not. They are usually clear about the ways in which it is valuable and the things they would like it to do which are not happening. One way of judging the effectiveness of advisory teams, therefore, is to ask headteachers and teachers for their views. This is what has been done in this study. Questions have also been asked of advisers, looking at issues affecting them such as organisation, training and the climate of the team, which may have some bearing on the extent to which they are effective.

A different approach to effectiveness is suggested by Miller and Inniss in their two papers (1990a and 1990b) on managing quality improvement in further education. Here they are concerned with defining standards and then looking for evidence which will show whether those standards are being reached. It would be possible to define standards in terms of the factual elements in advisory work, the number of visits being made, for example and in practice this is done by many LEAs including the 4 in this study. This gives no indication of the quality of these visits or what has resulted from them, however. All four of the teams in this study were concerned with how best to evaluate their work and all four have experimented with various ways of doing this but they come down to 3 approaches:

- collection of factual information and analysis of this, normally by computer;
- collection of views from teachers and headteachers about particular pieces of work, mainly in-service provision and inspection, either through questionnaires or through discussion;
- observation of whether ideas promulgated as part of in-service work have been implemented in the classroom or the school.

Of these the third option is extremely difficult to do and be sure that any change in classroom or management practice is the result of the work of advisers. A teacher or headteacher may have changed working practice because of many other influences.

The local authority advisory service is currently under threat from legislation which will make much of the money now available for local authority advisory services available to schools to buy inspection which may also be bought from other independent groups. It is likely that many existing services will attempt to run as consultancy services which schools can buy in. It remains to be seen whether this will produce an effective support for schools.

The current study sets out to look at the service as it now is and to look at what is associated with effective practice.

This study is concerned with only that part of the work of advisers and advisory teachers which concerns schools and teachers. This is in order to keep the study to a manageable size.
An equally important role is that which concerns the local authority where the service advises administrators and members of the Education Committee and its sub-committees.

The survey

In terms of research it would be comparatively easy to collect factual information about visits made, courses run and other factual information but this would not in itself give much information about effectiveness. It would also be possible select certain pieces of advisory work and follow them through in the schools to see if there was evidence of their effectiveness. This would give very good information about effectiveness but it would be a very large undertaking if enough information were to be forthcoming to generalise from the evidence. Another possible option was therefore used involving collecting views from the recipients of advisory work through questionnaires and interviews, since this seemed to offer the possibility of a good deal of evidence in return for the work undertaken.

The first requirement was therefore to arrive at some criteria by which effectiveness in advisory work might be judged. With this in mind, a group of 10 primary headteachers, 10 secondary headteachers, 20 primary teachers, 20 secondary teachers, 20 advisers/inspectors, 10 advisory teachers and 10 administrators were asked to give an account of an occasion when an adviser had, in their opinion, been effective. They were also asked to list the factors which they felt made the occasion one in which effective work took place. Examples of the replies are given in appendix 1.01. This comparatively large sample was invited to respond in the likelihood that response would be poor because it made a demand on people to think and to write and this is time consuming and people in education tend to be busy. Since the aim was simply to gather examples of good work there was no need to have a random sample and the questionnaires were distributed at a conference of the National Association of Inspectors and Educational Advisers. Those taking questionnaires were asked to distribute them in their own authorities. Replies were received from 12 teachers, 6 headteachers, 2 administrators, 4 advisory teachers and 5 advisers in 7 different authorities. The poor level of reply confirmed expectations but since the survey was anonymous it was not possible to follow up those who did not respond. In the event those who replied gave sufficient information for work to proceed.

Konttinen et al (1991, p.5) suggested that there was:

a need to find more structured ways to work on information of human behaviour to get a comprehensive or holistic view of people in their complex interactions with themselves, with others and with their environments; to achieve understanding about how the 'parts' make a whole.

They therefore developed the idea of a concept map. This idea was also suggested as a means of developing learning in the curriculum by Novak and Gowin (1984). The concept
map appeared to be a useful way of looking at the various views of effectiveness which were put forward by respondents. The ideas which emerged from the accounts of effective practice were put on paper and linked with each other where this seemed relevant. From this emerged six groups of ideas and these was set out as the concept map on the next page. The six categories were as follows:

- Inspection and evaluation
- Advice and help
- Teacher development
- Philosophy and approaches
- Knowledge, skill, experience
- Relationships

A seventh category also emerged from this analysis which is not included on the concept map - that of the culture, climate, organisation and management of the advisory team. Only one respondent referred to this but there is a great deal in the literature about effective schools which suggests that this is likely to be important in advisory teams also.
CRITERIA FOR EFFECTIVE AD VISO R Y W O R K
Fig 3.1
Observes
teachers at
work in the
classroom

Provides
written
reports

Follows up
inspection

Identifies
shortcomings

Inspection
and
evaluation

Analyses
problems
Provides
opportunity
for
discussion

Provides
advice and
guidance

Sets short
term goals

Advice and
help

Gives
positive and
negative
feedback

Respects the
views of
teachers

Provides
pre-inspection
opportunity
to explain

Has clear
objectives

Works in
non-didactic
way

Philosophy
and approaches

Has regard
for the needs
of schools

Evaluates
the work
of schools
through
inspection

Has good
general
knowledge
of education

Makes
constructive
comments

Is enthusiastic
and
stimulating

Plans with
teachers

Has concern
for children's
achievement

Has
personal
credibility

Has
specialist
skills

Knowledge,skill,
experience,

Has
professional
expertise

Challenges
situations

Works in
ways
suggested
to teachers

Provides
insights

Treats
teachers as
professional
colleagues

Plans and
organises
effectively

Communicates
effectively

Gives
confidence

Relationships
Provides
usable
ideas

Provides
effective
in-service

Teacher
development

professonal

Creates
enthusiasm

sensitive
Is nonthreatening

Uses teachers'
experience in
in-service work

48

approachable


Proposed effectiveness criteria

The concept map identified groups of criteria which were then re-arranged to generate a list, which follows, copies of which were sent to four chief advisers for comment. As a result the points marked b) were added and a few of the points stemming from the study were broadened to take account of a wider view. For example the item ‘works in a non-didactic way’ was widened to read ‘works in ways appropriate to the task in hand.’ Further points were also added as a result of studying the literature (see below) and these are marked a). Internal papers from LEA advisory teams were also studied and points stemming from these were added and marked c). Finally a small number of points were added, duplicating ideas already listed in order to provide a means of assessing reliability by using a split half test. These are marked d). According to Engelhart (1972, p.148) ‘the split half procedure involves scoring 2 halves (usually odd items and even items) of a test separately for each person then calculating a correlation coefficient for the 2 sets of scores.’ This involved ensuring that the list could be split in half and the 2 halves correlated. Details of the correlation are given as appendix 5.0. The final list as given formed the basis for questionnaires to be used at the next stage of the study. Copies of a sample of the questionnaires are given in appendix 2.0.

The lettering for these criteria was decided at an early stage. At a later point it seemed more sensible to place inspection, advice and support and teacher development first since these constituted key areas where effectiveness was immediately evident. Other areas contributed to these.

Each of the areas listed is analysed below so that a picture of the effective adviser or inspector emerges which is supported by literature and by the views expressed by those contributing to the survey.

**D Inspection/evaluation/analysis**

An effective adviser

1. Evaluates the work of schools through inspection
2. Monitors the standards of teaching and learning
3. Observes teachers at work in the classroom
4. Monitors the work of the classroom
5. Identifies shortcomings
6. Gives positive and negative feedback
7. Gives headteacher/teacher opportunity for preliminary explanation before inspection
8. Discusses work before and after inspection
9. Provides written reports
10. Provides verbal reports
11. Follows up inspection
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E Advice and help
An effective adviser:
1 Provides advice and guidance on work seen
2 Makes constructive comments
3 Helps teachers to plan their work
4 Identifies and helps to set achievable targets
5 Challenges situations
d)6 Helps teachers to think through ideas
c)7 Advises on resources for learning and teaching
d)8 Recommends appropriate resources
c)9 Supports work in the National Curriculum
e)10 Supports teachers dealing with assessment
d)11 Provides advice on teaching and learning
c)12 Advises on provision for pupils with special needs
c)13 Supports heads in making the school development plan
c)14 Supports heads in implementing the SDP
b)15 Supports heads and senior staff in management roles
c)16 Provides advice on the management of the curriculum
b)17 Works collaboratively with headteachers
b)18 Helps headteachers to analyse problems
b)19 Works collaboratively with governors
c)20 Takes part in the appointment of staff
d)21 Provides reports on the work of teachers when required
c)22 Supports teachers experiencing difficulty
c)23 Advises on new and refurbished buildings
d)24 Advises on equipment and other resources

F Teacher development
An effective adviser:
1 Provides insights
d)2 Makes teachers think
3 Uses teachers' own experience in in-service work
4 Provides usable ideas
5 Creates enthusiasm
d)6 Stimulates teachers
7 Works in ways appropriate for the work in hand
8 Works in ways he/she is suggesting to teachers
9 Provides effective in-service courses
10 Plans and organises effectively
c)11 Helps the school with its staff development programme
c)12 Helps the school to develop appraisal
A Philosophy/approaches
An effective adviser:

1. Has an overall vision of education
2. Has clear objectives and priorities
3. Respects the views of headteachers/teachers
4. Has regard for the needs of schools
5. Has concern for children’s achievement
6. Emphasizes the centrality of pupils

B Knowledge/skill/experience
An effective adviser:

1. Has personal credibility
2. Has good general knowledge of education
3. Has specialist skills
4. Has professional expertise
5. Is enthusiastic
6. Stimulates teachers trying to develop their work

C Relationships
An effective adviser:

1. Is sensitive
2. Is prepared to listen
3. Treats headteachers/teachers as professional colleagues
4. Is professional
5. Is non-threatening
6. Is approachable
7. Is supportive to headteachers/teachers
8. Gives headteachers/teachers confidence
9. Communicates effectively
10. Is clear and concise in the suggestions offered

G Culture/climate/organisation/management
An effective adviser:

1. Feels part of a team
2. Is involved in team planning
3. Knows team objectives
4. Plans with team objectives in mind
5. Knows team priorities
6. Decides own priorities in the light of team priorities
7. Meets colleagues regularly
8. Discusses fundamental issues with colleagues
9. Works with colleagues
10. Knows skills of colleagues
11. Supports colleagues
12. Finds colleagues supportive


Not all advisers inspect, in terms of visiting a school in order to make a formal judgment about its effectiveness and providing an oral and written report about the findings, though most inspectors advise in the process of feeding back their findings to the school. The majority of advisers at present, whatever their titles, visit schools for the purpose of inspection and also visit simply to advise although this is changing with the development of the privatised inspection service. Advisory teachers do not usually inspect in the formal sense although they may well help a school by reviewing some aspect of work as a preliminary to helping the school to improve it. This means that the area of inspection may not be one which is common to everyone with an advisory title.

An adviser evaluates the work of the school through inspection and observes teachers at work. In the process of doing this he or she identifies shortcomings, gives positive and negative feedback, discusses work before and after inspection, provides written reports and follows up inspection.

Fiske (1979) felt that a mixture of inspectorial and advisory work was neither undesirable nor unworkable. At the point in time when he was writing fewer advisers inspected schools in any formal sense though some did. Fiske saw advisers, whether they inspected formally or not, diagnosing difficulties as part of their role and, unlike Her Majesty’s Inspectors (HMI), working with the school to deal with the problems which emerged. Advisers needed to be expert in the skills of investigation and he anticipated the future in suggesting that inspection skills needed to be refined and improved. He thought that some of the work of advisers was in a consultancy role to the school in general and to the head in particular and as a counsellor.

The Audit Commission (1989, p.11) lists the benefits of formal inspection as perceived by inspectors and advisers as follows. (This is an unpublished part of the study by Stillman and Grant for NFER (1989) and gives the percentage of respondents giving each point of view):
advisers get to know and understand individual schools  
provides full information and reference points for the LEA (CEO, members, governors, parents)  
promotes adviser collaboration, encourages team ethos  
identifies teachers’ strengths/weaknesses/INSET needs  
assists management and organisation of school/department  
identifies good practice in schools  
promotes curriculum development  
helps schools identify needs and determine their goals  
improves school standards: is generally beneficial  

Wilcox (1989, p. 163) looks at inspection as an aspect of evaluation and notes that when evaluation is discussed, inspection is not usually included. He suggests that inspection ‘potentially represents a body of practical knowledge about how evaluation may be carried out in complex real life situations.’ He expands this in a more recent book (1992) and describes inspection by HMI and local authority advisers as ‘time constrained evaluation’

Winkley (1985, p. 124) expresses some of the doubts people have about inspection. He quotes a teacher:

The inspection in our school didn’t touch on reality. It failed to pick up the key staff-dynamics. It didn’t credit the strong people on the staff, or identify the weak ones. It didn’t begin to tell the story of how the school works.

He also quotes the views of two advisers on inspection:

It focuses almost entirely (and necessarily) on the visible ...and that is a kind of value judgment. It pressures the school into valuing such things as quiet behaviour, tidiness, handwriting, efficient administration - all virtues in their way, but relatively superficial.

It doesn’t move the school on. It’s of some use to the LEA, but the most important things are known already if the adviser’s doing his job properly.

The following accounts from the survey led to the criteria listed above.

Evaluates the work of schools through inspection, identifies shortcomings, gives positive and negative feedback and provides a written report, discusses work before and after inspection

A headteacher described a one day visit from their general inspector. The headteacher was told beforehand that the focus of the visit would be the quality of the learning environment and management and organisation.

He felt that this visit was effective because:
- school documents and information were studied before the visit;
- the headteacher had the opportunity to explain policy, recent staff changes, strengths/weaknesses etc. before classrooms were visited;
- there was both positive and negative feedback verbally and in the report;
the fact that there was a written report helped to convince staff that the visit had been important;
the inspector acknowledged that what she had seen on the day was not necessarily typical and said so in the report;
the report was made available to governors but was not ‘public’ and therefore isolated details could not be extracted and headlined by the press or parents;
the visit and the report identified realistic, hopefully achievable targets for future developments.

Observe teachers at work in the classroom; discusses work before and after inspection
A teacher described a visit from an adviser which involved looking at the teacher’s methods of planning and recording of core subjects and evaluation. In discussion the adviser made good suggestions which helped the teacher. The teacher felt that this was effective because of the attitude of the adviser. She listened very carefully to the points the teacher wished to make and was able to offer advice and strategies that could be adopted in order to overcome difficulties.

Helps teachers to analyse problems
An adviser described a departmental review of a science department, made at the request of the headteacher, following poor examination results and concern about low morale after an amalgamation of two schools. Every member of the department was seen teaching twice, as far as possible in different situations. The outcome was quite a lengthy report including a list of recommendations. The adviser felt that this worked effectively because the department as well as senior management was allowed to suggest aspects for the adviser to look at. This allowed him/her to identify shortcomings on the part of management (e.g. time-tableing). The adviser identified the things the department were doing well to give them points to build upon and gave them short term and long term objectives that were realistic and achievable and which he/she was confident would work.

In another school an adviser described the constructive criticism offered and many suggestions made during the course of an inspection, particularly advice on how to cope with a low ability and badly behaved group.

Advice and help

The survey suggested that the effective adviser provided advice and guidance on work seen, made constructive comments, helped teachers to plan their work, identified and helped to set achievable targets and challenged situations.
David Hancock, (1988, p.1) Permanent Secretary to the Department of Education and Science, in the speech to the Executive Committee of the National Association of Inspectors of Schools and Educational Advisers quoted on page 19, made the following points:

This (emphasis on inspection) does not mean that I believe your advisory functions and support to schools on curriculum development, in-service training and curriculum organisation should be reduced. On the contrary I am sure that much greater calls will be made on your advice and support as a result of the Government’s reforms.

Winkley (1985, p.96,97) gave 4 basic reasons why teachers may want help and advice:

These were:
- lack of knowledge;
- lack of skill;
- lack of confidence;
- lack of objectivity.

He stressed the value of the adviser who can counsel headteachers and teachers on personal and professional matters, understanding the complex working of the staff as a group and able to diagnose and offer solutions to problems of personnel management.

In his study of the styles of advisers in different authorities he found that more teachers disagreed with the statement ‘LEA advisers/inspectors understand very well the problems we have in teaching in our school’ (54.9%) than agreed with it (45.1%).

He also looked at the value of different kinds of advisory visits and found that among those most designated ‘very useful’ were those concerned with help in promotion and interviews. Interestingly, the highest score of all was for attending school events. Evaluation also scored highly.

Stillman and Grant (1989, p.115) quoted a headteacher describing his need for advisory support:

Even as an experienced head I feel the need for a general adviser. No one else has an overview of the school. I need help on strategies, managing people etc. No one else gives that. Generalists need to have senior experience and be knowledgeable to be of help.

Reid et al (1987, p.211) stress the importance of reflection in teacher development and note that the effective school values reflection with a purpose at teacher and school level and describes this as the outstanding characteristic of the extended professional teacher. They go on to describe the role of the critical friend in this process:

The role of (external) critical friend or process consultant is crucial within, for example, a formative evaluatory approach. Critical helpfulness is the essential ingredient. It is a matter of supporting development within a trusting relationship, by asking the awkward, challenging question.
Bolam et al (1978, p.77) quote an adviser describing his/her purpose in helping teachers:

I do not introduce major curriculum changes. I simply get people to think, question, express their own difficulties and search for their own solutions. I also put them in touch with other people trying out their own solutions.

This links well with the definition of consultancy by Gray (1988, p.7):

Consultancy ... is a helping relationship provided by people who have a particular range of skills for helping managers and others in organisations to understand more clearly what their business is about and how it might be more effective.

... During the process of consultation this general overview (as held by the consultant) will be focused and refined to clarify the particular and specific nature of the client’s organisation’s problem. As consultation proceeds, clients will themselves come to a greater and deeper understanding of their problems and possible solutions, so that by the time the consultant leaves there will be improved competence in the organisation itself.

The survey produced the following criteria:

*Provides advice and guidance on work seen; identifies and helps to set achievable targets*

Several comments note the advice and suggestions offered. For example, a headteacher giving an account of an inspection noted that the inspector concerned ‘identified realistic, achievable targets for future developments’. An advisory teacher followed up an in-service session on printing by helping a teacher to teach these skills to her class. She gave a great deal of advice and guidance, some of it by practical demonstration.

A teacher described how science schemes were discussed at a departmental meeting with the adviser offering straightforward advice and ideas which were extremely helpful.

*Makes constructive comments*

A teacher concerned with teaching a six week sequence on knowledge about language was joined by an advisory teacher who helped her in the preparation of materials and attended a lesson each week. This was seen to be effective because it provided:
- considerable help and guidance at the preparatory stages;
- many constructive comments on the delivery of the sequence.

*Helps teachers plan their work;*

A particularly interesting example was an advisory teacher’s account of his/her support for a section bilingue in which technology was to be taught in French. The advisory teacher
worked by team teaching for two mornings with the staff and supporting them at some
departmental training sessions. The main focus of support was team teaching with the head
of technology who needed linguistic support as all lessons were entirely in French. The
advisory teacher felt that he/she made an effective contribution in terms of methodology as
there was joint planning, delivery and evaluation of the lessons. The advisory teacher covered
basic foreign language teaching methodology, including ideas for the integration of IT
(information technology), use of the OHP (overhead projector), selective use of resources,
group work and differentiated activities. This was effective because of:
- the willingness of the teacher involved to collaborate with and be supported by an
  advisory teacher;
- the advisory teacher's own enthusiasm for team teaching as a method of support;
- there was regular collaboration - intensive at the start of the year, plus follow up
  contacts;
- early participation in the initiative meant the advisory teacher could make more
  informed contributions at some departmental in-service sessions.

Challenges situations
An adviser described work with probationers on classroom organisation noting that he/she
tried to make this challenging, in a tactful way, to the situations in which the teachers found
themselves.

Other areas in which advice and support are needed
Discussion with some other advisers, inspectors, headteachers and teachers suggested that
schools also look for help in thinking through ideas, advice on resources for learning and
teaching, support for work in the National Curriculum and assessment and on dealing with
pupils with special needs. Headteachers look for support in making and implementing the
School Development Plan, support in their management roles and on the management of
curriculum, collaboration with themselves and with governors, help with analysing prob­
lems, reports on the work of teachers when required, support for teachers who have difficulty
in the classroom, advice on equipment and other resources and on new and refurbished
buildings. These points were not mentioned by anyone in the survey but were evident in some
of the information from chief advisers, the literature and material from authorities.

A major role for advisers/inspectors, which was not mentioned but which was included
in the statements of aims from the Audit Commission (1989 cf.p. 18) and Dean (1992 cf.p. 19)
as being of considerable importance was in assisting at appointments. This was even more
important now that governors make appointments themselves without support from local
councillors who usually have more experience of appointing staff. Its omission from the
examples coming from the survey is probably largely a matter of chance.

Pearce (1986) noted the advantages of involving advisers or inspectors in the appointment process. The adviser will often have seen other applicants from the same schools. The specialism for the post in question may be outside the head’s area of expertise and he or she needs the advice of someone who is a specialist in that field. Advisers may have a more detached view of the quality of applicants since they will be interviewing people more frequently than any headteacher. They will also have an idea of the market and the availability of candidates for any particular post.

Teacher development

Respondents to the survey stressed that an effective inspector, adviser or advisory teacher provided insights, used teachers’ own experience in in-service work, provided usable ideas, created enthusiasm, provided effective in-service courses and planned and organised competently.

Bolam’s study (1978) found that 82% of advisers said they functioned to some extent as facilitators of educational innovation, but only 28% said they did so to a great extent. His respondents also stressed the lack of time to follow up courses and the need for advisory teachers to work in schools with teachers.

Dean (1991a) noted that advisers should have ideas about the way in which a school could provide training for particular purposes and the kinds of activities likely to achieve the desired ends and suggested that advisers should have many possible contributions to make to a school’s in-service programme, both as lecturers and as leaders of activities.

Jane and Varlaam (1981-2) described the development of curriculum support teams in the Inner London Education Authority and noted that much useful school-focused in-service education was being generated by their work.

Weindling and Reid (1983) writing of the relationship between teachers and teachers’ centres, made the point that teachers were more inclined to talk to advisers or centre leaders about the courses they would like than to fill in a questionnaire or identify their needs through the school.

Criteria were developed from the following accounts from the survey:

Provides insights
A teacher describing a six week sequence on knowledge of language stressed the point that the advisory teacher’s work gave her ‘great insight into both the students and my own oral skills from the transcripts and other sessions which were recorded.’
Uses teachers' own experience in in-service work

An advisory teacher leading an arts course noted that the course organisers recognised the teachers' arts' strengths and used them in a wider context.

Provides usable ideas; creates enthusiasm

A teacher described a County in-service day on A level English teaching led by an adviser. The sessions, led by teachers from other schools, changed the teacher's view of classroom practice and introduced him/her concerned to new ways of approaching texts, which were not just useful at A level but for all aspects of teaching literature.

A practical course in technology for primary school teachers was described by a teacher in which 'relevant and worthwhile tasks were placed in a classroom setting.'

Provides effective in-service courses

A teacher described a half-day course led by an adviser which united people teaching languages at A level. New types of syllabus were discussed, the requirements of exam boards, the possible routes forward for students for whom traditional A level teaching was unsuitable, new course material, sources of additional material etc. 'It was effective in being particularly "meaty" and professional, a rare opportunity to exchange views on a restricted and essential subject.'

Plans and organises effectively

An administrator wrote of an adviser who set up a course for heads and senior staff from secondary schools, sixth form colleges and administrators, involving a presentation by teachers from another authority on distance learning. This led to joint working by the two LEAs and the course was successful at least in part because of the very good organisation.

Another situation in which there was very good organisation was described by two advisers who wrote about work in a school where a section bilingue was being developed with two groups learning geography in French and later another group doing technology in French. The first adviser wrote of the situation as follows:

A section bilingue was set up in a secondary school in which geography was taught in French, leading to dual accreditation in GCSE. Work involved preparation of briefing papers, identification of resources, recruitment of staff, presentation to parents and staff and preparation of schemes of monitoring and assessment.

Another course where the planning was much appreciated was one of two training days for heads of English, where the course members particularly appreciated that there was time built into the course for reading and reflection. The teacher who wrote about this felt that the
course was successful because of ‘having time to assimilate the information and to think and also perhaps having the fact that we need thinking time acknowledged.’

**Philosophy/approaches**

The evidence from the survey of those using advisory services and from advisers and inspectors, suggested that the effective adviser or advisory teacher had an overall vision of education, clear objectives and priorities. He/she respected the views of headteachers/teachers, had regard for the needs of the school and concern for children’s achievement.

Several writers referred to the need for an advisory service to have a philosophy which guided its members’ approaches. Dean (1975a) pointed out that advisers needed a personally thought-out philosophy against which they could assess changes and developments. Whitaker (1990b, p.18) gave key questions which were intended to define the mission for a group of advisory teachers:

- what education business is the service concerned with?
- what purposes is it established to service?
- what vision of the future of the service is shared by staff?
- what are the intended end results of advisory teacher work?
- by what criteria will the service judge its successes?

A number of writers stressed the importance of vision in leadership, using this word to mean a clear idea of where the school or service is going. Beare *et al* (1989) regarded vision of where the school was going as one of the most important characteristics of headteachers. They suggested that the vision of a leader included a mental image of the future state of the organisation which embodied the leader’s view of what constituted excellence and included a vision of the future of the broader educational scene.

It is this broader vision with which we might expect the vision of advisers to be concerned.

Guthrie (1991, p.159) suggested that leaders should ‘possess a vision of what the organisation with which they are concerned should be like.’ He defined vision as the ability to assist all parts of an organisation in acquiring a sense of purpose. Advisers needed to have a vision of where the service was going and where the schools might be going. However, it would also be important for them to be aware of and work in cooperation with the vision of others.

The following accounts from the survey have contributed to the criteria given above:

*Has overall vision of education*

Although vision was not directly mentioned in the replies to the questionnaire it could be said
to be evident in the ways in which some of those concerned had chosen to work and the way in which they had selected material for teacher development. For example one teacher described how an in-service course run by an adviser and contributed to by teachers changed her view of how to work in the classroom. An inspector described the setting up of a section bilingue which involved teaching geography in French. These kinds of changes might be thought both to require vision and to develop vision.

**Has clear objectives**
A three day arts course was held for secondary teachers introducing them to new teaching and learning strategies. Teachers worked practically to create music, drama, dance, three dimensional art work, creative video. There was then a sharing of performance and discussion about work. They were also given stimuli to pursue in school teams and were asked to document the process. This led to presentations.

This was judged successful by the adviser reporting. He/she believed this was because there were clear objectives and it used learning strategies similar to those that were being suggested to teachers.

**Has respect for the views of headteachers/teachers**
A headteacher worked alongside his local inspector in looking at classroom practice, each observing four lessons and comparing notes. The headteacher commented ‘I suspect the inspector’s effectiveness is improved the more he works alongside the head. One of the factors which made this effective was the mutual regard which he and I have for each other.’

**Has regard for the needs of schools**
During a period when a local upper school was opting out, the other local schools were involved in a consultation process to determine their reactions. This culminated in the three heads having a meeting with the Secretary of State accompanied by the CEO and the leaders of all three political parties in the County. In the opinion of one of the headteachers involved, much of the coordination/advice/support at school level was due to the experience, expertise and advice of the adviser concerned. As a result a strong sense of belonging to the LEA ‘team’ was developed and there was genuine reference and contribution to the needs of LEA schools.

**Has concern for children’s achievement**
A review of primary schools in one authority followed by a series of visits resulted in schools making positive steps in their development. The adviser concerned felt that the factors making this effective were firstly recognition that monitoring and evaluation must be accompanied by advice and support and secondly a commitment to the view that ‘good’ schools address the issue of children’s achievement.
Knowledge, skill, experience

The survey suggested that the effective adviser, inspector or advisory teacher was seen as having good background experience and therefore personal credibility, good knowledge of his/her specialism and good knowledge of education. He/she also had professional expertise and did work of high quality. The effective adviser was enthusiastic and stimulating.

Fiske (1979) defined the skills of the adviser and suggested that an adviser needed qualities of tact and sensitivity which were not easily learned and would not be sufficient on their own. The adviser needed basic professional knowledge of such matters as curriculum theory and timetable planning. He or she also needed to have knowledge of a broad variety of techniques for analysing the workings of a school, with particular emphasis on methods of evaluation.

Whitaker (1990a, p7) writing of the skills needed by advisory teachers, listed the following:

- Policy development, curriculum planning, development tasks, assessment and testing, developing classroom practice, introducing new methods, tackling problems and difficulties, devising development activities, running school based workshops, National Curriculum training events, courses and conferences, designing course activities, taking part in LEA working parties, providing a specialist view, explaining policies in schools.

Pearce (1986 ) wrote of the adviser’s need for skill in reading the less obvious clues about the quality of a school, such as the way teachers and pupils talked to each other, the body language with which pupils entered or left or sat in classrooms and much else. Pearce also noted the way that the adviser’s presence modified what was happening in a classroom.

Klein (1985, p.36,39) described the ‘master teacher’, a form of development being tried out in some American schools which was not unlike our advisory teacher system, except that the master teacher was envisaged as being a member of staff of the school where he or she practised. He suggested that the skills and knowledge needed included:

- Alternative views of curriculum concepts and procedures to be used in curriculum development, knowledge of research regarding curriculum theory and practices, skills in curriculum design, techniques to bring about and manage change and the development of leadership skills. He/she should have done advanced university study in curriculum development and leadership skills, curriculum workshops, observation of other teachers at work.

(At the same time he/she) needs to remain in constant contact with the daily work of other teachers and aware of the challenges of classroom life. (He/she also needs) knowledge of teaching strategies, facility in selection and utilisation of different resources for stimulating learning, ability to plan both long range and short term goals and ability to translate plans into concrete classroom activities.
The following accounts from the survey have contributed to this set of criteria:

**Has personal credibility**
A curriculum design and technology (CDT) advisory teacher attended a meeting with a deeply sceptical CDT department. He was able to empathise with the teachers’ concern about the reduction of the skills content of the new courses and explore ways of targeting high priority skill areas and linking them with appropriate design briefs. He left them with clear tasks within their ability. This work, in the view of the headteacher, was highly successful partly because the advisory teacher showed respect for the skills held by more traditional colleagues and partly because of the advisory teacher’s recent successful classroom experience which gave personal credibility in the eyes of members of the department.

**Has specialist skills**
In another school an advisory teacher worked with a class to show the class teacher ways of developing children’s work in printing, following a course on this. The teacher noted that for her the effectiveness was in ‘experiencing at first hand the use of these techniques by an expert in the classroom, watching the children learn and sharing their experiences both at the time and later.’

Another example involved two training days which were held for heads of English. The teacher writing about this day felt that one of the reasons why the course was successful was in having information from a clear expert in the field - a senior inspector.

An advisory teacher was involved in the setting up of a resources centre, providing advice and helping to plan the management of the centre. She then carried out three evaluations during the first year of its operation, each with a different focus - systems, use, and effect on teaching styles. Following each evaluation she produced a comprehensive document and discussed this fully with the centre’s management team. These evaluations had a significant effect far beyond the centre. In the view of the headteacher one of the reasons why this work was effective was the precise matching of the advisory teacher’s skills with the task in hand.

**Has professional expertise**
The account given above of the adviser who helped the situation in which schools were opting out, (cf p.62) noted that a factor in the successful outcome was the professional expertise of the adviser concerned.

In another LEA an administrator described a situation in which the authority was involved in amalgamating schools. In the case he described, the advisory input was most effective because of the adviser’s detailed knowledge of the geography and staffing of the
school. His knowledge of staffing issues was again useful when consultation with staff and teaching associations began. The final stage of consultation with parents facilitated by his obvious in-depth knowledge of the school.

The administrator felt that there were a number of factors which made the work of this adviser effective, particularly:
- the knowledge of the detailed background of the school situation shown by the adviser;
- the professional expertise of the adviser in the presentation of the information and the handling of individuals and groups in a sensitive situation.

Does work of high quality
A teacher described early practical courses in technology and later work by the same team of advisers which helped teachers to interpret the statutory orders for design technology. The teacher felt that this work not only affected technology but had implications for work across the curriculum. One of the reasons why the course was successful was that ‘the deliverers were enthusiastic and committed primary practitioners.’ Another reason for success was the ‘exceptionally high standard of delivery with obvious attention to pre-course planning’.

Is enthusiastic and stimulating
A headteacher wrote ‘At the beginning of 1991 the school made a conscious decision to embark on a long term development of the school grounds into an environmental area. Although all the teachers were committed to the idea, expertise, knowledge and strategies were limited. An advisory teacher for environmental development viewed the grounds and discussed the project with staff and pupils and has made many return visits. Staff had learnt a lot about the “why” of environmental guardianship and the transformation process was under way.’

This was seen to be effective because of:
- the opportunity for an agreed need to be addressed;
- the enthusiasm of the advisory teacher;
- the advisory teacher’s style of delivery;
- the match of the subject to the school’s needs.

Relationships
Many of the replies to the survey stressed the importance of the relationships an inspector, adviser or advisory teacher built up with headteachers and teachers. The effective inspector, adviser or advisory teacher was sensitive to others and prepared to listen, acted towards
teachers as a colleague and was professional, non-threatening, approachable and supportive. He/she gave headteachers and teachers confidence.

Gibson (1981, p.181,184), reporting on a study of accountability in a group of secondary schools noted that:

The evidence of the Cambridge Accountability Project interviews suggests that the “good relations” advisers seek with teachers genuinely do exist and there is often a high level of mutual respect. Teachers who have regular and significant contact appear to understand the difficulties advisers face in successfully performing their diffuse and delicate task and see them as valuable colleagues not simply because they make available materials and equipment, but also because they can and do offer helpful advice and support in less tangible ways.

He quoted a teacher as saying, 'the whole question hinges around personal relationships and I suppose that what I realised is that the adviser’s first job is to build up relationships with colleagues.'

Winkley (1985, p.70) made the point that the way an adviser first arrives in a school is sensitive. He or she must first work to assess the general ethos of the school and to work out how to respond to its needs.

He also stressed the importance of approachability and trust from the adviser’s point of view, quoting an adviser as saying, ‘My job is to get to know the school to the point where I can be accepted to such an extent that the staff will start to talk to me convincingly about the kinds of problems they really have.’

Margerison (1978, pp.30,32) wrote of advisory work in industry but had much to say which is relevant to schools. He described his work as follows:

Clients usually come to an organisation development adviser because they wish to relieve pressure. They are looking for a way out of the complex web in which they feel locked. The main job of the adviser is to help the manager to discover his way out of the maze. In this sense the adviser plays more of a counselling, catalytic and process-oriented approach.

I want the client in such a situation to come forward, to explore, to consider his situation and put forward his concerns. He is unlikely to do this if he feels under pressure. It is vital to give the client air space and time to develop his own thoughts.

The skilled adviser knows where he wishes to channel conversation. He does not just respond. He listens and has a basis and reason for his response. He should be able to decide how to influence conversation.

Wise et al (1983) described a study of teacher evaluation in a number of districts in the United States. While this process was not the same as inspection, it nevertheless had in common with it the fact that a group of people were involved in making judgments about the effectiveness of schools and teachers and this appeared to make it relevant to the work of our advisory service. One finding stressed the need for sensitivity and noted that for success a
teacher evaluation system must suit the educational goals, the management style, the ideas about teaching and the community values of the school district.

This study was of interest but one would be critical of the fact that at no stage did the evaluation team appear to consider the extent to which the evaluation of teachers involved assessment of student performance.

The survey of examples of effective work helped to establish the criteria in general as well as specific terms. For example one adviser wrote of the need to counsel teachers who were failing and the importance of being able to do this while maintaining good relationships. Another described a project and noted the importance of good relationships in its success. The following examples gave rise to the criteria listed:

*Is sensitive*

The example given under ‘knowledge, skill and experience’ of the school reorganisation which showed professional expertise on the part of an adviser also speaks of the adviser’s sensitivity and the value of this in a difficult situation. (cf. p.64)

*Is prepared to listen*

A teacher explained that the school had drawn extensively on the primary mathematics team for workshops. These had been preceded by detailed discussion between the mathematics coordinator and a member of the primary mathematics team to ensure that sessions were geared to an identified need. This had been effective because of the willingness of the team to listen to teachers and provide in-service courses dealing with a specific need as identified by a group of teachers.

*Treats teachers as professional colleagues*

An advisory teacher for secondary mathematics came to discuss plans for work schemes for the National Curriculum and worked alongside the teacher to achieve the first draft. This was seen to be effective because:

- having an outsider to help in these tasks gave an added perspective to the work in hand;
- the adviser acted in the capacity of colleague and co-worker. Given his on-going work with the National Curriculum and schemes of work working parties, this was most helpful.

*Is professional*

The administrator who wrote of the adviser’s help over a school amalgamation spoke of the professionalism of the adviser concerned and the fact that the complexity of the proposal under consideration demanded detailed knowledge which only an advisory colleague could supply. (cf p.64)
Is non-threatening and supportive

An inspection visit to music department was described by a teacher. Its purpose was to evaluate criteria and an aide-memoire drawn up by the divisional team of inspectors. A large proportion of the day was concerned with assessment tasks on listening skills drawn up separately by two members of the department. This was one of the subjects discussed at the end of the day by the inspectors, the deputy head and head of department. The inspectors’ observations prompted the need for a common test and also underlined the need for the head of department to take more active role in the delivery of the department’s policies. This was effective in the view of one of the teachers concerned among other reasons because of the following:

- the non-threatening nature of the visit with its focus on evaluation of the inspectorate’s work;
- the open friendliness and support of the inspectors.

Is approachable and gives teachers confidence

An art in-service session was held with an advisory teacher which involved various methods of printing (cf.p.63). The teacher concerned found this helpful but lacked confidence to teach some of the skills practised. The advisory teacher came and followed up the work in the teacher’s class, teaching the children in small groups. The teacher was able to see how the techniques worked with her class. As a result she felt much more confident. The teacher commented, ‘My main fears have been allayed and I have learned a great deal. I also have more confidence to approach my art coordinator colleague for support as I try these techniques.’

Culture/climate/organisation/management

Studies of schools suggest that effectiveness is likely to be found where the staff work collaboratively and feel part of an overall team and culture (Little 1981; Reynolds (ed) 1985; Reid et al 1987; Mortimore et al 1988; Beare et al 1989). It seems likely that the culture of an advisory team will lead to effective working in a similar way. Evidence from the Audit Commission (1989, p.15) suggested that many services were not teams in the full sense of the word, but collections of individuals. The Audit Commission Report spoke of:

- lack of leadership from inspection and advisory service management, leaving advisers working isolation, both from their colleagues and from the general purposes of the LEA.
- lack of leadership of advisory teachers by inspectors and advisers; both groups cited this problem to the Commission team.
Stillman and Grant (1989, p.134) noted that headteachers would welcome more of a team approach to advisory work saying that they would welcome greater teamwork and cross fertilisation of ideas. They quoted a chief adviser as saying:

Advisers wish to work more as teams. We are looking towards functional teams which would look at specific curriculum areas and initiatives i.e. teamwork that has purpose and focus, then the team will disband and new teams will form.

Whitaker (1990b, p.11) lists the value of teamwork:

- it maximises staff expertise and experience;
- it involves staff in key management activities;
- it achieves a higher work rate than individuals working separately;
- it removes the frustrations often experienced when decision making is attempted in too large a group;
- it develops team skills and expertise;
- it facilitates professional development;
- it increases commitment and job satisfaction;
- it recognises four key motivators;
  a) affiliation
  b) appreciation
  c) achievement
  d) influence
- it makes better use of time;
- it allows a quick response to new problems.

This is another area where there was little mention of the issues in the survey but discussion with chief advisers and inspectors and reading suggest that it is one where there are important contributions made to effectiveness. A few advisers among the respondents to the survey mentioned work with colleagues. For example, one person spoke of ‘working with other primary colleagues to devise a primary aide memoire which went back to key principles in children’s learning and raised pertinent questions to be addressed in schools’ practice.’ This respondent was particularly appreciative of the time allowed for the discussion of fundamental issues which gave rise to the aide memoire. An advisory teacher speaks of the value of collaborative planning with other advisory teachers.

Good management and leadership are also important for the success of a team. Services where members feel part of a team, meet colleagues regularly and feel supported by them would seem likely to work more happily than those where people work in isolation. Involvement in the planning of the work of the team would seem to be important and opportunities for the personal development of individual inspectors, advisers and advisory teachers.
The training of advisers and advisory teachers

One further category was added. This was training of advisers and advisory teachers. This was not an area of effectiveness but complementary to the effectiveness criteria. It seemed possible that training would increase effectiveness and it was therefore important to know what training the advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers in each authority had experienced. Dean (1975b), Bolam (1978), Stillman and Grant (1989), the Audit Commission (1989), Dean (1991b and 1992) all noted that training for advisers was needed and existed far too rarely.

This list was based on literature and information from local authorities and was designed so that the results could be compared with a national survey by Dean (1991b) which asked about the training each authority had provided for its advisory service. The list which resulted is as follows:

*The training of advisers and advisory teachers*

An effective adviser needs the following training:

*1 Induction programme - introduction to the LEA
*2 Induction programme - introduction to advisory work
*3 Work on inter-personal skills e.g. discussion leadership
4 Selection interviewing
5 Work on different aspects of the inspection of schools
6 Report writing
7 Consideration of what is involved in supporting headteachers
8 Consideration of what is involved in working with governors
*9 Consideration of ways of working with teachers
*10 Training in management skills
*11 Training in the skills of running in-service education
*12 Provision of opportunities for up-dating knowledge
*13 Training in personal organisation e.g the use of time
*14 Training to work in other phases in education

* Items which apply to advisory teachers as well as advisers

**Situations in which it is possible to work effectively.**

Further analysis of information from the study suggested that the extent to which an adviser or advisory teacher can be effective is partly dependent on the situation in which he or she is working. Harland (1990, p.48) gives a list of factors affecting the work of advisory teachers. Those which are not in the control of the advisory teacher are as follows:
the degree of support and commitment to the input from the headteacher;
the degree of internal pressure on and support for teachers actually to implement changes to their
classroom practice;
the existence of an environment and climate within schools which encourage and reward teachers to
attempt innovation;
the existence within schools of self support systems and staff discussion groups;
the availability within schools of appropriate resources;
the availability of time for teachers to develop and apply new skills in the classroom;
the attitudes of individual teachers, in particular their proximity and compatibility to the advisory
teacher;
the 'selection' criteria and process by which schools are drawn into working with advisory teachers.

Biott (1991, p.12) noted the importance of promoting change in the classroom through
professional support and enquiry and stated that 'classroom practice can only be transformed
when the teacher's meaning itself is transformed.'

He also spoke of the problem for an advisory teacher when the school culture works
against him or her. He told of teachers who were welcoming of advisory teachers in their
classroom but who returned to a harder view in the staffroom.

Many of the respondents in the survey mentioned aspects of work which made it easier
for advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers to be effective. These included the response of
teachers, the support of headteachers and senior members of the advisory service and the
provision of resources, particularly that of time.

The response of teachers
An adviser wrote of the readiness of teachers to open their minds to new experiences.

The teacher described earlier (cf. p.63) who was enabled to develop work in printing
said 'I believe the effectiveness of the training was in acknowledging my own lack of
experience, the practical "hands-on" experience, experiencing at first hand the use of these
techniques by an expert, in the classroom, watching the children learn and sharing their
experiences.'

The teacher writing about music department which was inspected (cf. p.67) wrote of
the staff's mutual respect for one another and the head of department's sensitivity to his
colleagues.

Another teacher wrote 'Personally I was receptive to new ideas and needed to meet and
talk with people outside my own school.'

An advisory teacher wrote of 'the willingness of the teacher involved to collaborate
with and by supported by an advisory teacher.'

An adviser running a twenty week course for teachers of French in middle schools wrote
of the 'willingness and enthusiasm of course participants. They "soaked up" the ideas we gave
them.'
The support of headteachers and senior members of the school staffs and advisory service; the provision of resources

An advisory teacher noted that ‘the head was interested and supportive of the project’ and also that ‘there was planning time for the advisory teacher to talk with class teachers.’

An adviser spoke of a project having:

- clear support from the chief adviser and chief education officer;
- support and commitment from the headteacher and senior management of the school;
- good levels of support from a variety of agencies;
- significant additional resourcing both before and during the project;
- a very talented teacher at the school to see the project through;
- a long lead-in time for adequate preparation.

Two other advisers, speaking of different projects, noted the importance of time to plan.

Relationship of the findings to the aims stated

The statements about effectiveness should match in some degree, the aims stated at the beginning. If the list compiled by Dean (1992) from the papers by LEA teams is used, the match can be seen as follows:

1 To monitor, evaluate and report upon the quality of educational provision and the standards of learning and the implementation of local and national policy objectives.
This relates to the section on inspection and evaluation which includes items on all the points given here in some form except that one item in the criteria refers to the National Curriculum rather than to local and national policy objectives.

2 To provide the LEA with the information and advice needed to shape policy.
This is not part of the study (cf. pp. 45,46).

3 To provide a coordinated programme of advice and support for all schools and other institutions, particularly in the implementation of the National Curriculum and in the management of resources.
Advice and support is spelled out in considerable detail in the list of effectiveness criteria and all the points made here are included.

4 To promote the professional development of all teaching staff.
The section on teacher development covers this in some detail.
5  *To promote curriculum development, particularly in those areas not covered by the National Curriculum.*
   The items on providing advice on the management of the curriculum and supporting work in the National Curriculum do not necessarily cover curriculum development but could be taken to do so.

6  *To offer advice and guidance to governors and headteachers on teaching appointments.*
   This is stated under advice and help.

7  *To provide support and advice for the appraisal schemes of schools and colleges.*
   This is given under teacher development.

8  *To develop the work of the service and the individuals within it.*
   This is part of the sections on climate, culture, organisation and management and also of training

It can therefore be seen that the criteria of perceived effectiveness appear to cover the stated aims with few exceptions.

### The questionnaires

The next stage of the study was concerned with assessing effectiveness as perceived by the users of the service and by its members in 4 LEAs and looking at whether there was an association between the key areas of inspection, advice and support and teacher development and the other criteria of philosophy, and approaches, knowledge, skill and experience, relationships, climate, culture, organisation and management and training.

The criteria which have been defined were used as the basis for questionnaires to headteachers, teachers, advisers and advisory teachers. They can be found in Appendix 2.0
4 RESEARCH METHODS

Introduction

It will be evident from the account in chapter 1 that the local authority advisory service is currently under threat from legislation which will make the money now available for local authority advisory inspection services available to schools to buy inspection which may also be bought from other independent groups. It is likely that many existing services will attempt to run as consultancy services which schools can buy in. It remains to be seen whether this will produce an effective support for schools.

The current study set out to look at the service as it was in 1992 and to look at what was associated with effective practice. The key areas would seem to be inspection, advice and support and teacher development. These most clearly reflect the effectiveness of an advisory team since they are the areas in which headteachers and teachers make judgments about how effective their service seems to be. Other criteria may or may not contribute to these and one of the intentions of this study is to look at the relationships between these key areas and the areas of educational philosophy and approaches, knowledge, skill and experience, relationships, team climate and culture, organisation and management and training.

The research questions

The questions being considered are as follows:

1. What is effective advisory work?
   This has already been discussed in the preceding chapter.

2. What is the current situation of advisory teams in local authorities? (cf. chapter 5)

3. What are the priorities of headteachers and teachers for work by the advisory service? (cf. chapter 7)

4. How do these compare with headteachers’ and teachers’ views of what is being offered? (cf. chapter 7)

5. How do headteachers and teachers regard the inspections being conducted by local authority advisory teams? (cf. chapter 8)

6. How do headteachers and teachers regard the advice and help offered to them by local authority advisory teams? (cf. chapter 9)

7. How do headteachers and teachers regard the provision for teacher development made by local authority advisory teams? (cf. chapter 10)

8. How do headteachers and teachers view the educational philosophy and approaches of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers? Are they aware of the educational philosophy of these groups? (cf. chapter 11)
9. Is there a relationship between these views and those held of the work of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers in the key areas of inspection, advice and support and teacher development? (cf. chapter 11)

10. How do headteachers and teachers view the knowledge, skill and experience of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers? (cf. chapter 12)

11. Is there a relationship between these views and those held of the work of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers in the key areas of inspection, advice and support and teacher development? (cf. chapter 12)

12. How do headteachers and teachers view relationships with advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers? (cf. chapter 13)

13. Is there a relationship between these views and those held of the work of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers in the key areas of inspection, advice and support and teacher development? (cf. chapter 13)

14. How far do advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers feel themselves to be part of a team culture and climate? (cf. chapter 14)

15. Is there a relationship between these views and those held of the work of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers in the key areas of inspection, advice and support and teacher development? (cf. chapter 14)

16. How do advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers view the organisation and management of their teams? (cf. chapter 15)

17. Is there a relationship between these views and those held of the work of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers in the key areas of inspection, advice and support and teacher development? (cf. chapter 15)

18. What training (formal and informal) have advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers had for their work? (cf. chapter 16)

19. Is the training experience of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers in the 4 authorities studied, similar to the statements of provision listed in the national survey? (Dean 1991b). (cf. chapter 16)

20. Is there a relationship between formal training and headteachers and teachers' views of advice and support and teacher development? (cf. chapter 16)

**The overall pattern of the study**

This study was undertaken at a time when advisory services were in a state of turmoil because of changes being demanded by National Government. However, the fieldwork was undertaken before the changes actually took effect, although the outcomes of the study should have implications for the new patterns of working which are developing.
The study has involved the following:
1. The development of criteria by which effective advisory work might be judged (cf. pp. 49 - 52).
2. The development of questionnaires based on those criteria distributed to a sample of advisers, advisory teachers, headteachers and teachers in 4 different local education authorities. (cf. Appendix 2.0)
3. A national questionnaire survey of the way in which advisory teams are changing to meet the national requirements (cf. chapter 5). This was also partly based on the list of criteria.
4. Interviews with chief advisers and a sample of advisers, advisory teachers, primary and secondary headteachers in the 4 authorities. (cf. appendices 5.0, 5.1)
5. Interviews with the headteachers and staffs of 12 schools in those authorities which had been inspected by their local authority team of advisers. (cf. appendix 5.2)

The methods chosen

Researchers have a fundamental choice between qualitative and quantitative research methods. Patton (1990, p. 14) noted that the advantage of quantitative methods ‘is that it is possible to measure the reactions of a great many people to a limited set of questions, thus facilitating comparison and statistical aggregation’. Advisory services deal with large numbers of headteachers and teachers, all of whom have views about the effectiveness of the service they receive. It was therefore felt that a study of the effectiveness of the service should involve some study of the views of a substantial number of headteachers and teachers. This suggested that quantitative methods would be appropriate for some part of the study.

Patton also made the point that approaching fieldwork without the constraints of predetermined categories of analysis contributed to the depth, openness and detail of qualitative enquiry. He suggested that studies in which only one method was used were more vulnerable to errors linked to that method than studies which used multiple methods in which different types of data provided cross-data validity checks.

It was felt that the quantitative survey needed to be complemented by a more open-ended approach which would fill out the questionnaire replies. Semi-structured interviews were therefore arranged with chief advisers, advisers, advisory teachers, headteachers of primary and secondary schools and a group of schools where there have been a recent inspection.

The study therefore involved both quantitative and qualitative methods, with the one complementing the other.
The sample of local education authorities

The original plan for the study involved selecting a sample of six local education authorities. The criteria used to select them were as follows:

1. They should be representative of different types of local authority, for example, shire county, London borough, metropolitan borough.
2. They should be varied in size.
3. They should be situated in different parts of the country.
4. They should represent different forms of organisation. For example, authorities separating inspection and advice and authorities where these were undertaken by the same people; authorities separating specialist and general work and authorities where these were undertaken by the same people; authorities which had area teams and ones which were centrally organised.

The sample originally chosen met these criteria in the following ways:

Authority A
A small London borough centrally organised in which all advisers were both inspectors and advisers and undertook both specialist and general work.

Authority B
A medium sized metropolitan borough in the north of England. The team was centrally based but worked in area teams. All advisers were both inspectors and advisers and undertook both specialist and general work.

Authority C
A large county in the north midlands. The team was centrally based but worked in area teams. Specialist and general work was separated but all advisers were both inspectors and advisers.

Authority D
A medium sized midlands county. The team was centrally based but worked in area teams. Inspection and advice were separate activities as were specialist and general work.

Authority E
A larger London borough where all the money had been delegated to schools who had to purchase all services. The team was centrally based.

Authority F
A medium sized west of England county with a very rural population and few large towns. Inspection and advice and specialist and general work were not separated.

Authorities E and F withdrew at a late stage because of the changes being demanded by central Government. Four other authorities were approached but were unable to take part because of their preoccupation with educational changes. By this time a large amount of
information had been collected about the four authorities A to D and it was felt that this was sufficient to proceed.

The pressures on local authorities at the present time made it unlikely that any would be receptive to someone wanting to do research unless they were likely to gain something from it. Each authority was therefore offered the opportunity of an evaluation of its advisory work, which was welcomed by the 4 which were finally studied. (cf appendix 3.0) The material for the evaluation thus became the material for the research and each authority was given a report on its work. Since both the evaluation of the work of the advisory teams and purpose of the research was to discover what was effective in advisory work this dual purpose did not present a problem but was simply a matter of looking at the evidence gathered from 2 different points of view. The fact that it was an evaluation of the work of the local advisory team ensured that the authorities concerned offered good opportunities for studying what was happening.

The questionnaires

The study of samples of effectiveness (cf.chapter 3) provided a set of criteria which were listed under the following headings:

A Philosophy and approaches
B Knowledge, skill and experience
C Relationships
D Inspection
E Advice and support
F Teacher development
G Climate and culture
G Organisation and management
T Training

Each section of the criteria list was given a letter and each item a number and these were then developed into questionnaires (cf. p.49 for explanation of the order of the lettering).

Oppenheim (1966) described the use of Likert scales and a form of Likert scale was used for all the questionnaires but with a choice of only 3, rather than 5 alternatives. Three alternatives were preferred because in the case of the questionnaires concerned with priorities, 5 alternatives appeared to be more than were needed and it was then necessary to work with 3 alternatives in the other questionnaires so that they might be compared.

Oppenheim also stressed that where attitudinal questions were concerned sets of questions were more reliable than single opinion items. Since the questionnaires were
composed from sets of criteria derived from descriptions of effective practice it was fairly
easy to produce figures for each set of questions.

The questionnaires were developed as follows:

Headteachers' questionnaire 1
Headteachers were asked to mark items from D (inspection), E (advice and support) and F
(teacher development) as high, medium or low priority according to the priority they gave this
particular service. They were also asked to rate the service they received for each item as good,
average or poor. Authorities A and B were also asked whether they would buy this service.
Authorities C and D had recently asked their headteachers this question and felt it would not
be politic to ask it again.

Headteachers' questionnaire 2
Headteachers were asked to say whether they agreed, were neutral or disagreed with a series
of statements about their advisory team which were concerned with A (philosophy and
approaches), B (knowledge, skill and experience) or C (relationships).

Headteachers' questionnaire 1a
Headteachers were asked similar questions about advisory teachers to those about advisers
with some variations because of the rather different role of advisory teachers.

Teachers' questionnaires 1 and 2
These were comparable to headteachers' questionnaires 1 and 2 with some variations to meet
the particular concerns of teachers.

Teachers' questionnaire 1a and 2a
These paralleled the headteachers' questionnaires about advisory teachers but were rather
more full because of teachers' greater contact with advisory teachers.

Both the headteachers' questionnaires and the teachers' questionnaires contained
questions about the age group of the people concerned and their years in post. An analysis of
the results by age group and years in post was made for authority A. This yielded no results
in terms of differences according to age or experience and it was therefore decided to ignore
this information for the other authorities.
Advisers' questionnaire 1
Advisers were asked to agree, remain neutral or disagree with a series of statements about climate and organisation and management.

Advisers' questionnaire 2
The second questionnaire was about training. This differed from the other questionnaires in being derived, not from the criteria but from a list of training activities used in a national survey (Dean 1991b). The aim was to be able to use the national survey results as a basis for comparison with the 4 authorities in the study. Advisers were asked whether they had received satisfactory training, some training, little or no training in each item. They were also asked whether they would like training in each item.

Advisory teachers’ questionnaire 1a and 2a
The questionnaires for advisory teachers were similar to those for advisers with appropriate variations.

The distribution and returns
The questionnaires were distributed to 100 randomly selected headteachers in authorities B, C and D. Authority A had fewer than 100 schools so questionnaires were sent to all schools. Headteachers were asked to give questionnaires 1 and 2 to one teacher to complete and questionnaires 1a and 2a to another. This meant that while the headteachers were a random sample, the teachers were not. It would clearly have been desirable to have a random sample for teachers also but there were considerable problems about doing this. It would have meant asking local authorities for a full list of all their teachers and it seemed unlikely that they would be willing to do this.

Details of the returns from the questionnaires are given in the tables on the next page. The returns were very variable and it is difficult to account for some of the variation. There were differences in the way the 4 authorities treated the study and this probably accounts for some of the variation. The returns from authority A are better on all counts than those from elsewhere and this may be because the chief adviser met all the headteachers and explained that this was a study evaluating the work of the advisory team with which they could help. She then asked for their cooperation. There was also a preliminary meeting with the inspectorate at which the proposed pattern was explained. In authority B the chief adviser placed much more emphasis on the work being a research study and less on evaluation of the team and this may account for the low return from the advisory teachers in particular. A second letter was sent to all those who had not replied but this brought in very little more and
no more returns from advisory teachers. Authorities C and D supported the study and made this plain to schools and to the advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers but were not prepared to support the sending of a letter chasing those who had not replied on the grounds that their headteachers were under pressure and they did not feel it was right to press them further.

**QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS FROM HEADTEACHERS AND TEACHERS**

Fig 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Headteachers' actual returns</th>
<th>Headteachers % returns</th>
<th>Teachers' actual returns</th>
<th>Teachers' % returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS FROM ADVISERS, INSPECTORS AND ADVISORY TEACHERS**

Fig. 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Adv &amp; insp actual returns</th>
<th>Adv &amp; insp % returns</th>
<th>Advisory teachers' actual returns</th>
<th>Advisory teachers' % returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Scoring the questionnaires
The scoring of the questionnaires initially posed a problem. Each item was scored one, 2 or 3 according to the column ticked, with the positive column given the highest score in each case. Each section had a different number of questions, however, which made comparison difficult. This was overcome by arriving at an average score for each item. Scores above 2.50 will be referred to as ‘good’; scores between 2.00 and 2.49 as ‘satisfactory’ and scores of 1.99 or below as ‘poor’.

Validity and reliability
The way in which the questionnaires were developed created their validity. Each item was based on something that someone had seen as being effective. The questionnaires should therefore be testing effectiveness in some way.

The questionnaires were designed so that they could be tested for reliability using a split half testing procedure (Spearman-Brown). This has been described in some detail in chapter 3. The results of this correlation are given in chapter 17 and there is an account of how they were worked out in appendix 5.0.

The interviews
Patton (1990, p.24) made the following point:

Direct quotations are a basic source of raw data in qualitative enquiry, revealing respondents’ depth of emotion, the ways they organise their world, their thoughts about what is happening and their basic perceptions. The task for the researcher is to provide a framework within which people can respond in a way that represents accurately and thoroughly their points of view about the world or that part of the world about which they are talking.

Pope and Denicolo (1986, p.154, 155) made the following points about verbal dialogue:

Verbal dialogue, as opposed to any form of written questionnaire has advantages such as i) flexibility - areas which the interviewees signal as important to them can be followed up and ii) increased depth - the interviewees can be encouraged to articulate hows and whys as well as to illustrate their answers with exemplars so that their own personal interpretation of words becomes evident.

These quotations sum up the reasons for including interviews as part of this study. The questionnaires limited the replies by the questions chosen. The interviews, though semi-structured, still helped to balance the questionnaires by providing a much more open opportunity for discussion.
Pope and Denicolo also make the following point:

First of all one must acknowledge to oneself that the situational context and one's own personal intuitive theories colour interpretation.

This was clearly of importance in interviewing, particularly in this situation where the interviewer was known to the interviewees by reputation as well as, in some cases, personally. The best guard against the bias that this may be creating would seem to be the awareness of the interviewer that such bias is possible.

Oppenheim (1966) suggested that the most valid way to obtain an estimate of respondents' attitudes was to ask them some free-answer questions and let them take time and state their views in their own way. With this idea in mind, a range of advisers, advisory teachers, headteachers and teachers were interviewed using semi-structured questions and allowing a good deal of freedom in the way the discussion developed.

It was necessary to decide whether to interview individuals or groups. The advantage of interviewing groups is that the views of more people can be expressed in a shorter time. People also stimulate each other and it is rather easier to create a relaxed atmosphere in which people answer freely. One the other hand there is less time to pursue questions in depth and people will affect each others' responses. However, on balance it was felt that more information would be gathered by holding group interviews than by interviewing individuals.

It was not possible to select random groups for this purpose since a good deal depended upon whether people were free to be involved. It was therefore suggested to chief advisers, who were responsible for selecting the groups that they should contain people as follows:

1. A group of about five advisers which included the following:
   - a person in a senior post
   - someone who has joined the team recently
   - a person of substantial experience in the team
   - two other people

2. A group of about five advisory teachers which included people with the following responsibilities:
   - information technology
   - primary education
   - some aspect of secondary education
   - TVEI
   - some aspect of special education
A group of five primary head teachers and a separate group of secondary headteachers. In each case the chief adviser was asked to form a group which included heads from a variety of kinds of school, including primary, junior, infant, nursery and special in the primary group and also including a head:
- who had been a considerable time in his/her present post
- who had spent most of his/her time in the authority, in a variety of posts
- who was new in post and new to the authority
- of a very small school
- of a large school

The chief adviser was left free to select the schools which had been inspected. It would have been wiser to include more guidance here because the schools, with one exception, tended to be those where the inspection had gone well. They nevertheless yielded a good deal of information.

The questions asked
The interviews were semi-structured and were based on lists of questions. Questions were selected from these lists which were mainly used as prompts to get people talking. Leads which emerged in the discussion were followed up.

Interviews with advisers, including the chief adviser

1 Organisation
- How is your team organised?
- What senior posts have you? What are the responsibilities of each?
- Does each school have a pastoral adviser?
- What is the role of advisory teachers/ Who is responsible for them? How much involvement have they in the overall work of the team? Do they pose any particular problems?
- Are you losing advisers or advisory teachers as a result of spending cuts?

2 Management
- How is the work of your team managed?
- How free are people to plan their own time?
- What is required of everyone?
- What records are required?
- What use is made of them?
- What are you doing less of in order to meet the demand for inspection?
3 Inspection
- How are you fulfilling the requirement to monitor the work of schools?
- How many schools do you look at in the course of the year?
- What is the involvement of the school?
- To whom do you report?
- Are the reports public?
- How long after the inspection is it before the report is published?
- What sort of follow up to inspection is there?

4 School support
- What are you able to do to support schools?
- How much time do you devote to this?

5 Teacher development
- What role are advisers now playing in in-service training?
- What role are advisory teachers playing?
- Are schools taking up the training offered?
- How are you evaluating the effect of in-service training?

6 Planning
- What planning activities do you undertake?
- What involvement do advisers and advisory teachers have in the overall planning of the work of the team?

7 Adviser and advisory teacher training
- Is there a training programme?
- What does it cover?
- Does the programme include advisory teachers?
- Is there a programme of appraisal for advisers and advisory teachers?

8 Evaluation
- How do you evaluate the work of the team?
- Who is involved in this?

9 Climate
- How far do you feel that you work as a team?
- Do you have team objectives?
- Do you state team priorities?
- Is there the opportunity for people to discuss fundamental issues together?
- Do people work together?
- Are advisory teachers seen as part of the team?
10 Effectiveness
- What are the most effective things an adviser can do?
- If you were not constrained by national demands, how would you like to see
  advisers using their time? (chief advisers only)
- What are the characteristics of the effective adviser?
- What do you look for in appointing advisers (chief advisers only)?

11 The future (chief advisers only)
- How do you see the future?
- Are you planning to sell services?
- How far have you got with this?
- What services do you think schools will buy?

12 Personal (chief advisers only)
- How do you spend your time?
- How much time do you spend working with advisory colleagues?
- What time have you spent with advisory colleagues in the past week?
- What time do you spend visiting schools?
- What do you think are the most important things for you to do personally if your
  team is to be effective?

Interviews with advisory teachers

1 Organisation
- To whom are you responsible?
- Would you describe the way your work is organised?
- Are there any particular problems about this organisation?

2 Management
- How is your work managed?
- How free are you to plan your own time?
- What is required of all advisory teachers?
- What records are required?
- What use is made of them?

3 School support
- What are you able to do to support schools?
- How much time are you able to devote to this?
- Who decides which schools you support?
- Are there any problems about this way of working?
4 Teacher development
- What role are you now playing in in-service training?
- Are schools taking up the training offered?
- How are you evaluating the effect of in-service training?
- Are you able to follow up in-service training in the schools?

5 Planning
- What planning activities do you undertake?
- Who is involved in this process?
- Are you involved in any way with planning for the whole service?

6 Adviser and advisory teacher training
- Is there a training programme for advisory teachers?
- What does it cover?
- Is there an appraisal programme for advisory teachers?
- Are there any aspects of training which you would like but which are not covered?

7 Evaluation
- How do you evaluate your work?
- Who is involved in this?

8 Climate
- How far do you feel that you work as a team either as advisory teachers or as part of the main advisory team?
- Do you have team objectives?
- Do you state team priorities?
- Is there the opportunity for people to discuss fundamental issues together?
- Do people work together?

9 Effectiveness
- What do you think are the most effective things an advisory teacher can do?
- What are the characteristics of the effective advisory teacher?

Questions to headteachers
1 How often do you see members of the advisory team in your school? When was the last time someone visited?
2 Do they come with a given programme or are they free to work in whatever way seems best at the time?
3 What is your reaction to their visits?
4 Have you ever requested a visit from an adviser? If so, what purpose had you in mind?
5 How do you view the way your local service is organised at the present time?
Do you discuss your problems as headteacher with an adviser? Is he/she able to be helpful to you?

In what areas of your work do you welcome advisory support?

What services would you buy from the present advisory service? How do you view the prospect of buying services from them rather than having them available as a matter of course?

Have you had an advisory teacher working in your school?

What was your reaction to his/her work?

Local authorities are having to cut staff because of government charge capping. This may mean cutting the advisory service. Would you choose to cut advisers or advisory teachers?

What is your picture of the effective adviser? What is he/she like?

Have you people who fit this description in your local team?

What is your reaction to the in-service opportunities offered by your authority?

Are there any areas of work in which you would welcome a kind of advisory support which is not available at present?

Interviews in schools which had been inspected

How long ago was the inspection of your school? When did you get the report?

What preparation did the team do with you before the inspection? Were you happy with this? Was there anything they could have done to improve the programme?

How was the actual inspection organised?

Did you feel that enough was seen for valid judgments to be made?

Was there sufficient discussion with teachers before and after their work was seen?

Was there adequate feedback to the school generally immediately following the inspection?

Were you happy with the way the advisers operated in the school?

Were you happy with the outcomes of the inspection? Did you recognise the judgments made as valid? Was the picture of the school a recognisable one?

Were you happy with the written report?

What have you done as a result of the inspection?

What follow up has there been by the advisory service since the inspection?

How satisfactory has this been?

How were the governors involved?
Interviews with teachers

Teachers were questioned on general issues as well as inspection in the 12 schools visited. The following questions were the basis of the interview:

1. How often do members of the advisory team visit your school? When was the last time someone visited?
2. What is your reaction to their visits?
3. Have you ever requested a visit from an adviser? If so, what purpose had you in mind?
4. How often do you change what you are doing or do something new as a result of a visit from an adviser or advisory teacher?
5. Do you ever discuss your problems in the classroom with an adviser? Is he/she able to be helpful to you?
6. In which areas of your work do you welcome advisory support?
7. What is your picture of the effective adviser? What is he/she like?
8. Have you people like this in your local team?
9. Have you experienced working with an advisory teacher?
10. What is your reaction to this experience?
11. What is your reaction to the in-service opportunities offered by your authority?
12. Are there any areas in which you would welcome advisory support which is not available at present?

These questions produced an enormous variety of material. Not all questions were asked of every group because in some cases an individual question would lead to interesting discussion which was pursued and this meant that there was not time to finish the list. Where this happened it was the more factual questions which were omitted.

All groups talked very freely and were prepared to be critical as well as positive about their experiences.

Analysis of interview material

The interviews were transcribed and analysed according to the criteria described in chapter 3, thus adding to the information gleaned from the questionnaires.
5 THE NATIONAL SURVEY

A questionnaire survey of all authorities was undertaken in February 1993 to see what changes were being made in the organisation and work of the advisory services. This was undertaken in collaboration with the Educational Management Information Exchange. A copy of the questionnaire is given in appendix 2.0. It was hoped that the survey would give a perspective on the results of the study. Sixty four authorities replied (53%). This included 27 counties, 22 metropolitan boroughs and 15 London boroughs.

The survey looked at the following:

1. The extent to which authorities had moved from providing a free advisory service to one for which schools would be expected to pay.
2. The services which authorities were making available to schools other than their own.
3. The services which were being discontinued.
4. The extent to which the services were becoming involved in the arrangements for inspection of schools under the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) and LEA plans for inspection.
5. The effect of the changes on the numbers of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers.
6. The services which authorities were expecting to provide for further education and sixth form colleges.
7. The extent to which the LEAs would be expected to pay for advisory services.
8. The future organisation of advisory services.

Services provided from September 1993

Twenty services were listed covering roughly the same items as those listed in the questionnaires in the study under D, E and F, i.e. inspection, support and advice and in-service education. LEAs were asked to tick in columns under the overall headings ‘Services provided in September 1992’ and ‘Proposed service provision from September 1993’. The columns under the second heading were ‘Provided free by the LEA’, ‘Available on sale to LEA schools’, ‘Available on sale to other schools’ or ‘Service discontinued’.

In the event there was misunderstanding on the part of some authorities over the section on services in 1992 and 33 (52%) ignored this section altogether. With so large a number omitting the section it seemed likely to yield little useful evidence to set alongside the proposals for 1993 and no attempt was made to analyse such information as was given. It seemed likely in any case that almost all of the services listed would have been part of the work of the advisory service in most authorities.
The replies were analysed under types of authority i.e counties, metropolitan boroughs and London boroughs as well as for all these authorities together.

The overall picture
It was clear from the way the forms were completed that a number of authorities were offering a mixed economy with some services paid for and some free. There were also some authorities where the basic service was free and the schools were able to buy extra. Five counties were selling some services to secondary schools but providing them free to primary schools.

Some authorities were providing a basic service free and selling further services. Overall more services were still being provided free than for payment. There were only 3 exceptions to this. These were provision of in-service courses, (48% offered free and 76% for payment), advice on learning and teaching strategies (52% offered free and 62% for payment) and supporting National Curriculum development where both the free service and the payment service were offered by 62% of authorities. (NB these figures include authorities which were both offering services free and also for payment.)

The following are offered by 75% or more of authorities as a free service:
- Monitoring action taken following inspection - 50 authorities
- Advice on provision for pupils with special needs - 55 authorities
- Involvement in the appraisal of headteachers - 56 authorities
- Advice on headteacher appointments - 53 authorities
- Advice on problems in schools - 45 authorities
- Support for schools in developing staff appraisal schemes - 45 authorities
- Advice on the design and equipping of new schools - 53 authorities
- Involvement with education otherwise and home tuition - 55 authorities
- Monitoring and advice on health and safety - 52 authorities

Although some of these are statutory requirements for the LEA several authorities are charging for these services.

Only one service had more than 75% of authorities offering it for payment and this was in-service education. This was also the service most often offered to other schools.

A few authorities offered all or almost all the services listed to other schools although only two authorities list ‘Involvement with education otherwise and home tuition’ The following are listed by 40% or more LEAs:
- Providing advice and support following inspection - 26 authorities
- Providing support and help with staff development programmes - 28 authorities
- Provision of in-service courses - 37 authorities
- Advice on school management - 30 authorities
Monitoring and supporting the progress of the School Development Plan - 27 authorities
Advice on problems in schools - 26 authorities
Supporting National Curriculum development - 31 authorities
Advice on learning and teaching strategies - 33 authorities.

Very few services were to be discontinued. One authority was planning to discontinue ‘Monitoring action taken following inspection’ and another ‘Advice on headteacher appointments’. Four authorities were planning to cease ‘Acting as general/link adviser’ and one ‘Supporting National Curriculum development’. Two would no longer provide ‘Support for schools in developing staff appraisal schemes’ and one would not provide ‘Advice on the design and equipping of new schools’. Six authorities would discontinue ‘Advice on teacher appointments’ and 5 would no longer provide ‘Support for individual teachers’. Two planned to give up ‘Involvement with education otherwise and home tuition’ and one ‘Monitoring and advice on health and safety’.

Comparison of types of authority
The counties had nine items where more authorities were providing services for sale than free. The metropolitan boroughs had only 2 such items of which one had the same number of free items and items for sale. The London boroughs had 4 of which 2 were the same numbers. These differences may simply reflect the differences in numbers of authorities replying.

There were only 6 items where 75% or more county authorities were providing a free service compared with 10 items in each of the metropolitan boroughs and London boroughs. Given the larger number of county authorities this was probably a genuine difference with counties more likely to sell services to schools. This is borne out by the percentage of counties given under each of the items on sale to LEA schools. The counties list had 2 items where 75% or more of the authorities were planning to sell while the other authorities had no items at this level. It also had 17 items where the percentage of authorities planning to sell was 40% or above compared with only 2 items from the metropolitan authorities and 8 in the London boroughs.

The London boroughs had the highest proportion of services they were planning to sell to other schools than their own with 16 of the items having 40% or more of authorities planning to sell. Comparable figures for counties and metropolitan authorities were 12 and 1 respectively.

The metropolitan authorities had the highest proportion of services they were planning to discontinue although the numbers of these were very low. There were ten items which individual borough authorities were planning to give up compared with only 2 in the counties and 2 in the London boroughs.
### COUNTIES SERVICE FROM SEPTEMBER 1993

#### SERVICES COUNTRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The percentage is the percentage of counties which replied ticking this item</th>
<th>Provided free by LEA</th>
<th>Available on sale to LEA schools</th>
<th>Available on sale to other schools</th>
<th>Service discontinued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring action taken following inspection</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing advice and support following an inspection</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing support and help with staff development programmes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of in-service courses</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on provision for pupils with special needs</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on school management</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and supporting the progress of the School Development Plan</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in the appraisal of headteachers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on headteacher appointments</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting as general/link adviser</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on problems in schools</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting National Curriculum development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on teaching and learning strategies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for schools in developing staff appraisal schemes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on the design and equipping of new and remodelled schools</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on teacher appointments</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for individual teachers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement with education otherwise and home tuition</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on resources for learning</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and advice on health and safety</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other services (please specify)*
## Fig 5.2 MET BOROUGHS SERVICE FROM SEPT 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICES METROPOLITAN BOROUGHS</th>
<th>Provided freeby LEA</th>
<th>Available on sale to LEA schools</th>
<th>Available on sale to other schools</th>
<th>Service discontinued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The percentage is the percentage of boroughs which replied ticking this item</td>
<td>No %</td>
<td>No %</td>
<td>No %</td>
<td>No %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring action taken following inspection</td>
<td>17 77</td>
<td>3 14</td>
<td>6 27</td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing advice and support following an inspection</td>
<td>17 77</td>
<td>6 27</td>
<td>7 32</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing support and help with staff development programmes</td>
<td>14 63</td>
<td>8 36</td>
<td>7 32</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of in-service courses</td>
<td>11 50</td>
<td>14 63</td>
<td>11 50</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on provision for pupils with special needs</td>
<td>18 82</td>
<td>5 23</td>
<td>5 23</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on school management</td>
<td>17 77</td>
<td>7 32</td>
<td>7 32</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and supporting the progress of the School Development Plan</td>
<td>17 77</td>
<td>7 32</td>
<td>6 27</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in the appraisal of headteachers</td>
<td>19 86</td>
<td>2 9</td>
<td>4 18</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on headteacher appointments</td>
<td>21 95</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>3 14</td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting as general/link adviser</td>
<td>15 68</td>
<td>4 18</td>
<td>5 23</td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on problems in schools</td>
<td>17 77</td>
<td>5 23</td>
<td>5 23</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting National Curriculum development</td>
<td>15 68</td>
<td>11 50</td>
<td>7 32</td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on teaching and learning strategies</td>
<td>12 54</td>
<td>12 54</td>
<td>8 36</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for schools in developing staff appraisal schemes</td>
<td>15 68</td>
<td>5 23</td>
<td>3 14</td>
<td>2 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on the design and equipping of new and remodelled schools</td>
<td>17 77</td>
<td>2 9</td>
<td>3 14</td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on teacher appointments</td>
<td>11 50</td>
<td>5 23</td>
<td>5 23</td>
<td>5 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for individual teachers</td>
<td>11 50</td>
<td>7 32</td>
<td>5 23</td>
<td>4 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement with education otherwise and home tuition</td>
<td>19 86</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on resources for learning</td>
<td>14 63</td>
<td>8 36</td>
<td>4 18</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and advice on health and safety</td>
<td>13 59</td>
<td>5 23</td>
<td>2 9</td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services (please specify)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LONDON BOROUGHS SERVICE FROM SEPT 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services London Boroughs</th>
<th>Provided free by LEA</th>
<th>Available on sale to LEA schools</th>
<th>Available on sale to other schools</th>
<th>Service discontinued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring action taken following inspection</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing advice and support following an inspection</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing support and help with staff development programmes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of in-service courses</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on provision for pupils with special needs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on school management</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and supporting the progress of the School Development Plan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in the appraisal of headteachers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on headteacher appointments</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting as general/link adviser</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on problems in schools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting National Curriculum development</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on teaching and learning strategies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for schools in developing staff appraisal schemes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on the design and equipping of new and remodelled schools</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on teacher appointments</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for individual teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement with education otherwise and home tuition</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on resources for learning</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and advice on health and safety</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fig 5.4  OVERALL SERVICE FROM SEPTEMBER 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICES ALL AUTHORITIES</th>
<th>Provided free by LEA</th>
<th>Available on sale to LEA schools</th>
<th>Available on sale to other schools</th>
<th>Service discontinued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The percentage is the percentage of authorities which replied ticking this item</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring action taken following inspection</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing advice and support following an inspection</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing support and help with staff development programmes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of in-service courses</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on provision for pupils with special needs</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on school management</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and supporting the progress of the School Development Plan</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in the appraisal of headteachers</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on headteacher appointments</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting as general/link adviser</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on problems in schools</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting National Curriculum development</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on teaching and learning strategies</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for schools in developing staff appraisal schemes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on the design and equipping of new and remodelled schools</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on teacher appointments</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for individual teachers</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement with education otherwise and home tuition</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on resources for learning</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and advice on health and safety</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services (please specify)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is interesting to consider the reasons for the differences among the groups of authorities. The Education Authorities Yearbook (1992) gives the numbers in advisory teams in relation to the number of schools in each authority. A study of these figures reveals that counties are generally staffed at a relatively lower level than metropolitan boroughs which in turn are worse staffed than the London Boroughs. Since the counties are normally larger in the number of schools and in geographical size than either the London or the metropolitan boroughs they might be expected to have larger teams relatively to make up for time spent travelling and the need for middle management posts. In practice this is not the case and this may partially account for the fact that more counties than boroughs are planning to sell services to their schools and for the fact that more boroughs are planning to sell services outside their own authority. The counties are likely to have difficulty in providing services once they have been reduced in size and by selling services they may be best able to survive. London boroughs, being better staffed can more easily provide services for those outside the authority.

There are also probably political reasons for the differences. The counties tended at the time of this survey to be more likely to be conservative controlled and therefore more interested in developing the free market the government would like to see than the urban authorities which were more likely to be labour controlled.

Other services being offered
The questionnaire asked authorities to state other services being offered. The following were listed:

Whole school inspections; further education (FE), adult education (AE) inspections; inspection of aspects of a school; managing centres; induction of new teachers; headteacher induction; headteacher mentoring; library services; initiatives across schools; information technology; specific projects; accredited quality development programme; financial services; information and statistics; support for redeployment; music; outdoor and environmental education; preparation for inspection; supported self-evaluation; pre-inspection audit; general advice; surveys; National Curriculum moderation; analysis of performance indicators; publications on aspects of curriculum; investigation of complaints; advice on redundancy; general advice for governing bodies; courses for administrative, professional and technical staff; brokerage for open university courses; accredited National Vocational Qualifications (NVQ) management development courses; professional accreditation; assessment coordination and post inspection support.
Numbers of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers

The money for financing OFSTED inspections was taken from LEAs at a time when local authorities were finding it difficult to maintain services because of financial pressures. The LEAs were also losing advisory staff because of grant maintained schools which required them to contribute the cost of centrally maintained services such as the advisory service. This meant that the majority of authorities were reducing their advisory services and the questionnaire asked for details of numbers involved of both advisers/inspectors and advisory teachers. The results showed that county authorities were reducing from 885 advisers in September 1992 to 752 in September 1993, a reduction of 15%. Metropolitan boroughs were reducing from 447 advisers to 335 (25%) and London boroughs from 233 to 190 (18%). Overall this was a reduction from 1565 to 1277 (18%).

Maychell and Keys, (1993) asked a similar question for the period between September 1991 and September 1992. This showed an addition to existing teams of 6 advisers and a loss of 35; i.e. an overall decrease of 29 posts nationally. Advisory teacher numbers increased by 4 and decreased by 48, giving a national decrease of 44 posts.

When we consider that, in addition, many advisory teams will be spending much of their time inspecting schools and dealing with headteacher appraisal, it appears that the service schools are likely to receive will be more limited than in the past.

The reductions in advisory teachers were even more disturbing. In the counties there will be a reduction from 809 to 508 (37%). In the metropolitan boroughs the reduction is from 439 to 253 (55%) and in the London boroughs the reduction will be from 222 to 142 (36%). Overall the reduction is from 1470 advisory teachers in September 1992 to 903 in September 1993 (38%). This study has shown that teachers rate advisory teacher support highly, in many cases more highly than adviser support. This reduction is therefore a matter for concern, especially as there will also be a lack of adviser support at a time when teachers need support in developing the National Curriculum and in assessment and activities such as headteacher appraisal are likely to be expensive in adviser time.

Government intention here is probably to create private teams which schools can buy in. Advisers and advisory teachers losing their jobs are likely to go into consultancy if they can find enough work to make a living. Two of the chief advisers of the 4 authorities in this study had already left for this purpose before the study was completed. Both intended to set up groups which could tender for OFSTED inspections and also provide advice and training for schools. The private teams will then be competing with the residue of local authority teams who will also be selling services. This places schools in a position where they can make a choice but choice may be difficult until the abilities of the teams operating in any area are
known. It is also unlikely that schools will have very much money for this purpose and they may well choose to spend it on staff and books and equipment rather than advice. The Canadian experience in a similar situation is that schools operated a quid pro quo with other schools, advising each other rather than paying an outside agent for advice.

There must also be concern that there will be schools which need firm advice and persuasion to change their ways. Most authorities are retaining a small force of advisers who may find themselves spending a great deal of time in the worst of their schools and with the worst of their teachers. There will be complaints from parents which need to be dealt with and there will be schools which appear to satisfy parents but which are not giving children a full education. These need advisers rather than consultants. Some poorly performing schools may be identified as a result of the four yearly inspection but in the meantime children will suffer an inferior education. In the past authorities have been aware of such schools and advisory services have tried to do something about them. This may not be possible in the future because it will be difficult for the reduced service to know the schools.

There must also be concern about the size of the residual teams of advisers. The Audit Commission Report on advisory services (1989, p.30) stated that ‘It is hard to see how the range (of skills) could be achieved with fewer than 17 inspectors and advisers.’ If this measure were applied to the teams as they will be next September, 2 counties (7%) would have inadequate teams, 12 of the metropolitan boroughs (54%) would not have enough skills to do the work and nor would 13 of the London boroughs (87%). There are also individual cases where the numbers are very low indeed. One county has a team of only 7 advisers. Five metropolitan boroughs have teams in single figures of which the lowest is 4. Five London boroughs also have teams in single figures of which the lowest is 5. It seems likely that other authorities will have to follow the example of authority A and its neighbours who have decided to create a consortium in order to have the necessary range of skills. One London borough had also made its whole advisory team redundant and was relying on buying in any advice it needed.

Advice to further education, tertiary and sixth form colleges

Authorities were asked whether they planned to offer a service to further education, tertiary and sixth form colleges. Twenty one counties hoped to do so, 11 metropolitan boroughs and 11 London boroughs, 43 authorities altogether.

All services would, of course, be charged for, either on the basis of subscription or ‘pay-as-you-use’. Services mentioned included on-site consultancy, curriculum and department audit, support for staff development, appraisal, help with records of achievement, the development of quality assurance schemes, appointments, evaluation/review, post TVEI
consortium, support for planning, work on course improvement, especially A level and GCSE provision, arrangements for curriculum continuity with schools and pay roll.

Advice to the LEA

This study has not been concerned with advice to the LEA but it was thought relevant to include it in this survey to see the extent to which services were being sold to LEAs by advisory services.

All the advisory teams would continue to advise their LEAs but 10 of the counties would charge for this advice and 16 would give it free. Two advisory teams would charge for some advice and supply other advice free and 3 authorities did not reply to this question. In the metropolitan boroughs 5 would charge for advice and 16 would give it free. One authority did not reply to this question. In the London boroughs 6 were charging for it and 10 giving it free. Two would charge for some advice and give other advice free and one authority did not reply.

Inspection plans

The 27 counties which replied to the questionnaire planned to have 376 Registered Inspectors and 571 team members. The 22 metropolitan boroughs expected to have 256 Registered Inspectors and 189 team members and the 15 London boroughs, 130 Registered Inspectors and 114 team members. This gives 762 Registered Inspectors altogether and 874 team members. This suggests a need for a good many more team members who may presumably come from former HMI, higher education, and retired advisers and headteachers although presumably advisers will sometimes act as Registered Inspectors and sometimes as team members.

Three hundred and seventeen of the Registered Inspectors and 518 of the team members in counties would also do advisory work. In the metropolitan boroughs 232Registered Inspectors and 171 team members would also do advisory work and in the London boroughs the numbers were 95 and 93. Only one authority planned to take no part in the OFSTED inspection programme and there were a small number of individual advisers in other authorities who would concentrate on advisory work and do no inspection. There would be 35 of these in the counties of whom 22 were from the authority not taking part in OFSTED inspections. There would be 43 in the metropolitan authorities and 13 in the London boroughs. This gives 91 altogether.

Authorities were asked what their plans for inspection were. Seventeen authorities planned to concentrate on bidding for inspection of their own schools. These included 12
counties, 4 metropolitan boroughs and 3 London boroughs. It is easier for county teams to
bid for their own inspections because their larger numbers mean that it is easier to assemble
a team which does not know the school to be inspected, which is a requirement. It is also easier
to assemble a team from a larger number of inspectors. Authority A, for example, does not
have the full range of specialisms in its team of inspectors and normally had to involve
advisory teachers in inspections of secondary schools in order to provide a sufficient range
of expertise. The reductions in team size recorded above will make it even more difficult for
teams in the London boroughs and in some metropolitan boroughs to tender.

Seven authorities planned to tender for schools outside their own authorities as well as
within and 2 metropolitan boroughs planned to bid outside but not within, presumably
because of the difficulty that everyone in the team knew all the schools. Thirty two authorities
stated that they would bid for OFSTED contracts but did not say whether this was within their
own authority or outside it or both.

Nine authorities made the point that they would be continuing with their own pattern
of inspection for the next year. Three stressed support for schools and one Welsh county made
the point that support would take priority.

Future patterns of organisation

The majority of authorities had reorganised in order to meet the changes which the reduction
in financial provision had forced upon them and the coming changes in the provision of
inspection.

A London borough (1993, p.1) in a paper to committee, set out the principles on which
its advisory service operated. These were as follows:

- The primary client is the learner or young person.
- All learners are of equal value and entitled to equal access to education.
- The education of the whole person is important and s/he should be actively involved in her/his own
  learning.
- Each pupil or student is entitled to continuity of curricular progression and learning experience.

A west of England county (1993, p.6) provided a general paper about the advisory
service which gave their view of the role of the inspector/adviser:

The role of the inspector is a taxing one. Inspectors must work as critical friends able to enquire freely,
speak frankly and advise honestly and yet must be able to return regularly to work in harmony with a
school and its staff. Such a relationship makes demands both upon the officer and the institution. It has
to be nurtured over a long period of time, for the good of the schools and colleges and the well being of
the service. The relationship must not be founded on anything less than personal honesty and total
professional integrity.
A north west county (1993, p.9) in a paper to its Education Committee which considered the alternative possibilities for the future, made the following point about its advisory service:

The County Council would be very seriously weakened as an LEA if it were unable to offer any curriculum leadership based on clearly articulated values, except through external consultancy. Schools might feel less willing to remain with a County Council which had no direct input on curriculum support and development.

Six authorities were operating with a separation of advice and support. A north west borough, for example, described its provision as 'separate services for inspection and advice, both with their own budgets which would be self-financing by April 94.'

Twenty three authorities - 13 counties, 6 metropolitan boroughs and 4 London boroughs were organising on the basis of business units of one sort or another. The following were some of the descriptions of the way services will be operating:

i) Head of inspection team to purchase advisers' time for inspections from the Chief Adviser.
ii) Schools to purchase advisers' services through a service level agreement.
iii) A proportion of advisers' time to be funded by centrally held funds as 'core' time.

West of England county

A series of self-managing teams under an overall business manager, but with 4 cross team management functions: marketing, research and development, quality assurance, appraisal/staff development.

West of England county

Schools have been asked and have agreed to subscribe to maintain a wider team of advisory teachers in 1993-4 for National Curriculum areas. Non-subscribers will be charged a daily rate for consultancy.

Northern metropolitan borough

The inspectorate will be disbanded and a core team of 3 will fulfil a monitoring role. The advisory team will operate a trading account prior to a full externalised service.

London borough

One London borough had provided a document for schools (undated) which gave the charges it makes for inspection and advisory work. Inspection was charged at £320 a day with a discount of 10% for inspections lasting 5 days or more. Advisory work, mainly with advisory teachers, was charged at £260 for each full day.

A west of England county (1993) had also provided a document for schools which included detailed information about what schools were entitled to if they subscribed to the advisory services. The charges for the basic entitlement were £829 per school plus £3.13 per pupil. Subscribers could then purchase additional services at a cost of £338 per primary school plus £1.95 per pupil, £900 per special school plus £1.95 per pupil and £2, 250 per secondary school plus £1.95 per pupil (p.3, 4).
An east coast county (1993, p.1) provided a publication which set out its services in detail but not their cost. The introduction is headed ‘How IATS will work for you’ which includes the following paragraphs:

The new Inspection, Advice and Training Services (IATS) unit is established on sound business principles to offer high quality services to schools, colleges and other clients. It has been formed in such a way that it is capable of providing a full and comprehensive range of services to schools and colleges.

Quotations for work will be provided quickly and we can explore a range of approaches which are tailored to meet your budget and your needs. We can also provide packages of services which are particularly helpful to the smaller school or schools with limited budgets.

A south midland county (1992, p.2) in a paper to committee noted that the time between OFSTED inspections was long and there was a need to monitor schools on a regular basis.

The LEA will therefore continue to need to monitor and evaluate its schools and provide crisis support, in order to carry out its duties and commitments. It is recommended that a ‘framework for Curriculum Monitoring’ be developed which would consist of a monitoring schedule for all schools to complement the national inspection programme. It is hoped to subsume, as far as possible, the substantial documentation required by OFSTED and the Department for Education (DEE) in order to minimise the load on schools.

A north west county (1993, p.14) described a survey of the views of its schools about delegation of a wide range of services including the advisory service. While there was general support for delegation, the smaller primary schools expressed concern, pointing out that a per capita basis for delegation would be disadvantageous to them. It would be necessary to find a way to devolve money to small primary schools which allowed them to buy back the services they needed. The headteachers also made the point that:

Short term considerations of the market should not be allowed to diminish services which schools would continue to need in the long term but which might not survive on the basis of being dependent on buy back at a time of considerable financial constraint.

A Welsh county (1993, p.1,5) expressed concern about many aspects of the changes in a paper to its Education Priorities Sub-committee and lists some fundamental considerations to be considered in making changes:

i) The strategic aims of safeguarding values and aims, the spirit of partnership, good practice, experience and expertise, and to transfer as much as possible of what is considered of value in the present system to the new system;
ii) The need to develop a new framework to support a different kind of relationship with our schools;
iii) The need to develop an effective marketing system, which demands a major attitudinal change within the authority;
iv) The need for a support programme to enable the Department’s staff to develop the kind of new skills that will be required to manage the change successfully.
The same authority makes a clear statement about the change in relationships between LEAs and schools:

Priorities will need to be established to a far greater degree in schools rather than centrally. The present arrangements whereby the authority takes the lead with regard to service developments and establishes priorities in consultation with schools will be inverted: the schools will decide which services they require to meet the objectives set out in their Development Plans, and the services which are provided will need to be responsive and appropriate.

Eight of the authorities replying were still working out the best way to organise their advisory work.

Summary

1 More services were to be offered free than for payment, but some authorities were operating a mixed economy with some basic services provided free and further service provided for payment. Many authorities were providing a basic package for which schools could subscribe plus a ‘pay-as-you-use’ service. More counties were selling services than metropolitan or London boroughs.

2 All services were being made available to other than LEA schools by a number of authorities. Nine services would be made available by 40% or more of authorities.

3 Very few services were to be discontinued. The metropolitan authorities were planning to discontinue 10 items compared with only 2 in the counties and London boroughs.

4 All but one authority planned to become involved to some extent with OFSTED inspections. Seven planned to bid for schools outside their own authorities as well as within and 2 metropolitan boroughs planned to bid outside only.

5 The changes coming about have resulted in serious decreases in the numbers in the service. There would be overall, a reduction of 18% in the numbers of advisers and 38% in the numbers of advisory teachers by September 1993. When the time for inspection is taken into account, this must leave comparatively little time for advisory work. It is also a matter for concern that 2 counties, 12 metropolitan boroughs and 13 London boroughs will have fewer than 17 advisers which was the figure considered by the Audit Commission (1989) to be the minimum size needed for an effective team.
6 Forty three authorities planned to offer services to further education, tertiary and sixth form colleges.

7 Twenty one authorities planned to charge their LEAs for advice.

8 There was a variety of different types of organisation planned. Six authorities were planning to separate advice and inspection, some with regret. Twenty three authorities were organising on the basis of business units of one kind or another. There was some recognition of the need to continue monitoring the work of schools.
6 THE FOUR AUTHORITIES STUDIED

The work of the advisory teams in four local education authorities was studied in some detail. The four authorities were chosen to represent different geographical areas of the country and different forms of organisation (cf. p.76). One, referred to as authority A, was an outer London borough and another, authority B, a metropolitan district in the north of England which consisted of a central town and a number of small towns and villages. The two others were both shire counties, one, authority C, in the north midlands and the other, authority D, in the south midlands. The authorities varied considerably in size. Authority A had a total population of 133,900, which makes it among the smallest of the outer London boroughs. It had 51 schools and an advisory team of 9, a ratio of 5.1 schools per adviser. Authority B’s total population was 312,000, which is somewhere near to the average size for metropolitan districts, with 185 schools and an advisory team of 22, a ratio of 8.4 schools per adviser. Authority C had a total population of 891,900. This places it among the larger counties. It had an advisory team of 44 and 427 schools, a ratio of 9.7 schools per adviser. Authority D had a total population of 525,000, which is near the average for shire counties, 315 schools and an advisory team of 33, a ratio of 9.4 schools per adviser.

Each authority also had a quota of advisory teachers. Authority A had a team of 19 which helped to compensate for the gaps in specialisms in the advisers’ team. This gave a ratio of 2.7 schools per advisory teacher or, if advisers and advisory teachers are added together, a ratio of 1.8 schools per member of the advisory team. Each advisory teacher was responsible to an adviser.

Authority B had 21 advisory teachers, a ratio of 8.8 schools per advisory teacher or 4.3 schools per member of the advisory service. In authority C there were 48 advisory teachers, a ratio of 8.9 schools per advisory teacher or 4.6 schools per member of the advisory service. Authority D had 52 advisory teachers, a ratio of 6.1 schools per advisory teacher or 3.7 schools per member of the advisory service.

Each of the four authorities was differently organised. Authority A organised its team so that everyone was involved in both inspection and advice and each member was also responsible for a group of schools. There were senior posts for primary and secondary education and these two advisers coordinated work in the two sectors. The small size of the team meant that some people had a very large specialist load which included areas in which they were not expert. The team dealt with this by involving some advisory teachers in secondary school inspections, with the agreement of the school, in order to bring in specialist advice. The advisory teacher then advised the person inspecting. The local area was generally an affluent one and although two grammar schools remained, the standard of work in the other secondary schools was generally high.
Authority B also organised its advisory team so that everyone had both a specialist and a general role. The team had had a long period of stability under the same chief inspector and had been able to enhance its primary team in recent years so that primary schools generally had a link adviser who was a primary specialist. The team also had an area organisation. The area was a mixed one with both rural and urban schools.

Authority C had a history of a service which visited schools when invited by the school to do so. This had to change with the demand of the 1988 Education Act for LEAs to inspect schools and the authority had fairly recently reorganised its team so that every school had a general adviser and this pattern was gradually becoming established. There was also a division into specialist and general advisers with 23 general advisers and 15 curriculum advisers. This authority also divided its overall team into area teams. The county included inner city schools, schools in small towns and small rural schools.

Authority D had met the demand for inspection by dividing its team into inspectors and advisers, each paid the same salaries. This division meant that it was necessary to duplicate each specialism and unfortunately the financial constraints on the authority had made this very difficult to do so that 3 people were still working in both capacities. The change had been instigated by a new Chief Education Officer and was not popular with any group although the inspectors said that it gave them more time to consider what was involved in the process of inspection. One headteacher described it as ‘bureaucracy gone mad’. On the other hand, the chief adviser felt that it made rather easier the transition to the new situation. The county included inner city schools, schools in small towns and rural schools.

Authority A (1991, p.3) stated its function as being:

1. On behalf of the authority, to monitor the quality of the education in the schools and colleges it maintains.
2. To provide the authority and the officers of its central departments with professional advice relevant to the discharge of their functions.
3. To advise schools and colleges: in effecting improvements where the need for these has been identified by the inspectorate; in pursuit of initiatives of headteachers, principals and governing bodies with the aims and priorities of the authority

Authority B (1991, pp.2,3) saw the tasks of the advisory service as follows:

- to work on behalf of the authority to promote its policies - not least, good quality education;
- to undertake a monitoring and developmental role within the context of the individual school/college, overall LEA policies and legislative requirements;
- to promote policies and good practice through a repertoire of means - for example, personal contact, in-service education, publications and reports;
- to recognise that advisory work has many different facets - curricular, managerial, administrative, interpersonal and legal;
- to work with different groups, for example, LEA members, professional officers, governors, headteachers, other staff, parents and young people.
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Authority C (1990, p.3) listed the following principles:

As a service we believe that:

- our work should support schools/colleges, centres to improve the quality of education for students;
- support for the curriculum and curriculum development should be an integral part of our work;
- monitoring, evaluation and inspection will play a central part in providing this support. This should be undertaken in partnership with school/colleges/centres;

As a service we can only achieve the work required of us by the LEA and by schools/colleges/centres if we:

- ensure that each school/college/centre is well known by at least one adviser;
- identify and agree our priorities in the light of the LEA Development Plan;
- plan our work systematically;
- are clear about our role and functions;
- work together with the rest of the Education Department.

Authority D (1990, p.6) stated adherence to the following principles:

- the centrality of the learner;
- the importance of people;
- a commitment to quality;
- ever improving efficiency;
- collective responsibility.

It aimed to offer support and advice of a high quality in the following areas of activity:

- development planning;
- curriculum development;
- professional development;
- resource development;
- institutional review;
- review of individual standards.

All 4 authorities were keen to have their work evaluated by someone outside the authority and were prepared to cooperate in making arrangements for the distribution of questionnaires and by arranging interviews. The final reports given to the authorities gave information about how their work was viewed by headteachers and teachers. They also gave information about the priorities for advisory work as seen by headteachers and teachers and views of the service in relation to these, together with information about the views held of inspection, advice and support, philosophy and approaches, knowledge, skill and experience of advisers and advisory teachers and the relationships advisers and advisory teachers were making with schools. The reports also gave information about advisers' and advisory teachers' views of the climate, organisation and management of their teams and their views of the training they had or had not received. The chapters that follow go into each of these areas in greater detail.
7 HEADTEACHERS' AND TEACHERS' PRIORITIES FOR ADVISORY WORK

Introduction

As the cost of advisory work is gradually transferred to schools, it becomes increasingly important for advisers to know what services they require most. The second question in this research is therefore 'What are the priorities of headteachers and teachers for work by the advisory service?' This chapter also looks at the third question which is 'How do these compare with headteachers' and teachers' views of what is being offered?'

Relevant literature

Maychell and Keys (1993, p.35, 36) asked headteachers to grade the service they received under various headings as 'very good', 'quite good' or 'not good'. They found that the most highly rated item was 'support for the head' which around 40% of primary and secondary heads and around 30% of special school headteachers judged to be 'very good'. Almost 40% of headteachers were critical of the amount of time given to the school by the advisory service, saying that this was 'not good'. About half the headteachers were dissatisfied with 'help in school development planning'. However, some respondents were conscious that the lack of time given to schools was the result of financial constraints.

There were also comments from nursery school staff which were similar to those made in the current study (cf.p.199):

Subject advisers are very little use to primary/nursery phase. Consequently the two primary phase advisers we do have are over-worked and spread very thinly.

Bamborough (1992, p.122) made a survey of what heads of department wanted from the advisory service. This showed that:

objective comment, curriculum involvement, innovation and initiation, training, guidance and counseling of subject staff, promotion techniques i.e. interviewing skills, special events attendance i.e. open days, curriculum evenings etc. evaluation were areas where help and expertise were valued from advisers. It was felt that the 'personalised service' getting to know subject staff, working in schools, discussing plans and initiatives were invaluable. Heads of department recognised the problem but felt that these things were at the heart of advisory work.

Bamborough also describes the way in which advisers can bring groups of teachers together to work at a common interest

Hiscock (1992) describes the response of ten members of one school staff to a study by
a local authority which asked teachers about their order of priority for the key objectives of the advisory service. The teachers, in every case, placed the support role of the advisory staff at the top of their list but 6 felt that the authority would give most priority to the monitoring and evaluation function and 4 identified as the first objective of the LEA ‘to work closely with other LEA officers to meet the needs of schools and the objectives of the LEA’ although they had some doubts about the needs of schools in this objective. All but 2 thought that the authority would place the objective ‘to support the development of schools’ either fourth or fifth out of 5.

The questionnaires

Chapters 3 and 4 described the development of questionnaires which were distributed to a random sample of headteachers and to teachers selected by their heads. The first task on these questionnaires was to grade the items given in terms of the priorities they seemed to represent.

Headteachers and teachers were asked to complete the questionnaire by ticking in columns headed ‘high priority’ ‘medium priority’ or ‘low priority’ against 27 items in the case of headteachers and 22 items in the case of teachers, each of which listed a particular task or activity of the advisory services. Headteachers were also asked to grade 8 items against a list of tasks and activities of advisory teachers and teachers were asked to do this for 14 items.

Items ticked under ‘high priority’ scored 3 points, those ticked as ‘medium priority’ scored 2 points and those under ‘low priority’ scored 1 point. In authorities A and B headteachers were also asked which services they would buy back from the authority. The other two authorities had recently asked this question of schools and did not wish to ask it again.

The same questionnaire also asked headteachers and teachers to grade the service they felt they had received from the advisory service under ‘good service’, ‘average service’ and ‘poor service’ and ‘service not used.’ These gradings were again scored with 3 points for ‘good service’, 2 points for ‘average service’ and one point for ‘poor service’.

There is a difficulty in making the comparison between the priorities as defined by the headteachers and their views of the service because of the item ‘service not used’. However it was possible to calculate the scores so to compensate for these items and a decision had to be made about whether this should be done or not.

There are two opposing points of view about advisory work. One was defined as follows by Wadsworth(1990, p.507).

We recognise that the advisory function should be adjusted to provide equal entitlement to all schools with an assured quality of service in terms of both monitoring and inspection.
The other view can be seen in this exchange between two advisers:

A You've got this real tension between providing equity of service spreading across and actually effective service and the two might be in opposition to each other. It might be very difficult to achieve equity and to achieve effective service at the same time and that's one thing that I'm always thinking about and trying to work out strategies to sort of balance the two in some way, but I think it's very difficult.

B I don't know how general it is. I've got a number of exploding schools and I spend more time with those exploding schools than I do with the general run. And all the talk of equity ... the kind of thing that has been said in the re-structuring ... memos that we had is that we guaranteed that a school would have the same kind of attention as others. Well I don't think that should be real - certainly not in my area.

Advisers, authority C

It was therefore necessary to make a choice between the two viewpoints. All four authorities were attempting to provide equity of service and from this point of view it seemed reasonable to interpret the judgements about their services in those terms. However, some of the items marked 'service not used' were items such as 'Advising on the design and equipping of new accommodation' and items which referred to inspection which not all schools were likely to have experienced and it was therefore decided to compensate for them.

**The priorities and views of headteachers**

*Priorities in the work of advisers*

The individual scores were added to give the table on the next page. This gave the overall order in which the headteachers placed the tasks and activities listed, together with the ranking in which each authority placed these items and the ranking for primary and secondary schools separately. As can be seen there was a good deal of agreement about the priorities. Inspection related activities and the National Curriculum and assessment were near the top of all the lists. No inspection related activity was lower than half way down the list - the lowest placed was 'Identifying shortcomings in the school' which might be said to have a threatening overtone.

We might expect some items to be higher in the lists. 'Supporting the school in helping teachers experiencing difficulty' might be expected to come higher than 14th. 'Advising on the appointment of staff' (22nd) is surprisingly low as is 'Advising on equipment and other resources' (25th) and 'Advising on the design and equipping of new accommodation' (26th) although this was probably because few schools have had this experience.
**HEADTEACHERS' ORDER OF PRIORITY FOR THE TASKS AND ACTIVITIES OF ADVISERS AND INSPECTORS**  
*Fig. 7.1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D8 Discussing work both before and after inspection</th>
<th>Overall order</th>
<th>Authority A</th>
<th>Authority B</th>
<th>Authority C</th>
<th>Authority D</th>
<th>Primary schs</th>
<th>Secondary schs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1 Evaluating the work of the school through inspection and other visits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9 Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 Giving positive and negative feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9 Providing verbal reports</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11 Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Monitoring the standards of learning and teaching</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7 Giving heads opportunity for preliminary explanations pre-inspection</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E19 Working collaboratively with headteachers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10 Providing written reports</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10 Supporting teaching dealing with assessment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12 Advising on provision for pupils with special needs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E22 Supporting the school in helping teachers experiencing difficulty</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E18 Helping headteachers to analyse problems</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15 Supporting the head and senior staff in their management roles</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11 Advising on provision for learning and teaching</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F12 Helping the school to develop its plan for appraisal</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11 Supporting and helping with staff development programmes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E16 Providing advice on the management of the curriculum</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14 Supporting headteachers in implementing the school development plan</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E20 Advising on the appointment of staff</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13 Supporting headteachers in making the school development plan</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E19 Working collaboratively with governors</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E21 Providing reports on the work of teachers when required</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24 Advising on equipment and other resources</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E23 Advising on the design and equipping of new accommodation</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fifteen of the headteachers replying were heads of secondary schools. This meant that the replies were heavily weighted in favour of primary schools. Primary and secondary school rankings were given separately but they do not differ greatly. ‘Advising on the design and equipping of new accommodation’ may be rated more highly for secondary headteachers because more have experienced this and because secondary school accommodation is more specialist than at primary level. Secondary headteachers rated ‘Advising on pupils with special needs’ more highly than primary headteachers and also ‘Advising on equipment and other resources’ although this was only rated nineteenth.

Primary headteachers’ answers when analysed separately differed from those of secondary headteachers in very few items. They rated ‘Following up the findings of inspection’ more highly and this may be an important point for advisory teams to note. They also rated more highly ‘Working collaboratively with headteachers’. This was perhaps not surprising in that primary headteachers usually have fewer colleagues with whom to discuss problems than their secondary counterparts and have perhaps a greater need for discussion with an adviser. They rated less highly advice on special needs and ‘Monitoring the standards of teaching and learning.’ In the case of monitoring standards they may have felt that as heads they were able to monitor standards themselves to an extent which would not be possible in a secondary school.

**Services which headteachers would buy from advisers and inspectors**
The headteachers in authorities A and B were also asked to tick those services they would buy providing, of course, that they could afford them. The list that follows is a combined list from authorities A and B. There were very few differences between the views of headteachers in these 2 authorities and where differences occurred they were very minor. The numbers are the numbers of ticks each item received. The percentage is that of the possible number of ticks this represents.

1 56 (79%) Evaluating the work of the school through inspection and other visits
2 52 (73%) Providing written reports
3 50 (70%) Monitoring the standards of learning and teaching
4 49 (69%) Discussing work both before and after inspection
5 46 (65%) Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection
6 44 (62%) Giving heads the opportunity for preliminary explanations pre-inspection
7 43 (61%) Supporting teaching dealing with national assessment
8 43 (61%) Supporting the school in helping teachers experiencing difficulty
9 41 (58%) Giving positive and negative feedback
41 (58%) Providing verbal reports
41 (58%) Supporting work in dealing with the National Curriculum
41 (58%) Advising on provision for pupils with special needs
13 40 (56%) Identifying shortcomings in the school
14 38 (53%) Working collaboratively with headteachers
15 36 (51%) Helping headteachers to analyse problems
36 (51%) Advising on the appointment of staff
17 35 (49%) Supporting the head and senior staff in their management roles
18 34 (48%) Supporting and helping with staff development programmes
19 32 (45%) Providing advice on the management of the curriculum
20 30 (42%) Supporting headteachers in implementing the school development plan
21 29 (41%) Advising on provision for learning and teaching
22 28 (39%) Advising on the design and equipping of new accommodation
28 (39%) Helping the school develop its plan for appraisal
24 26 (37%) Supporting headteachers in making the school development plan
26 (37%) Providing reports on the work of teachers when required
26 16 (22%) Advising on equipment and other resources

It is interesting to note that the order here is different from that of the priority list. For example, 'Providing written reports' came 9th in the priority list but was 2nd in order of preference here. 'Supporting work in the National Curriculum' was 3rd in the priority list but 9th here. This is partly explained by the fact that we are dealing with only 2 authorities and this is their combined view, but the differences are interesting nevertheless and have implications for the services which advisory teams might offer.

Comparison of headteachers' priorities and their views of advisers
In each authority headteachers were also asked to give their views about the service offered by the advisory team and this was compared with their priorities. The next 5 pages give this comparison for each of the 4 authorities.

The comparisons showed a very different pattern for each of the 4 authorities. Authority A inspectors were ahead of the others in meeting the priorities of the headteachers. In only one of the 27 items did the headteachers regard the service they received as being more than 0.2 of a point below what they saw as being a priority and in 19 items the service was regarded as being on a level with the score for priorities or above. The items where the service score was more than 0.21 below the priority score were 'Advising on provision for pupils with special needs' (2.45 and 2.02), and 'Supporting the school in helping teachers experiencing
difficulty. Seven items had service scores of more than 0.2 above the priority scores and 3 had service scores of more than 0.4 above the priority scores. These were ‘Supporting headteachers in making the school development plan’ (1.84 and 2.32) ‘Providing reports on the work of teachers when required (1.98 and 2.46) and ‘Advising on equipment and other resources’ (1.55 and 2.26).

Authority B had 19 items where the service score was more than 0.2 below the priority score and 4 where the service was rated better than the priorities. These were ‘Advising on the appointment of staff’ (2.38 and 2.54), ‘Providing reports on the work of teachers when required’ (2.11 and 2.18), ‘Advising on the design and equipping of new accommodation’ (1.81 and 2.14) and ‘Advising on equipment and other resources’ (1.77 and 1.89). The most negative scoring items (i.e. items where the service score was below the priority score) where the scores were more than 0.4 apart were ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’ (2.81 and 2.16) and ‘Advising on provision for pupils with special needs’ (2.73 and 1.70).

Authority C had 8 items where the scores were negative and more than 0.2 apart. However they also had 9 items where the service was rated better than the priorities. The following had service scores of more than 0.2 of a point above the priority scores: ‘Providing verbal reports’ (2.43 and 2.65), ‘Supporting headteachers in making the school development plan’ (1.96 and 2.26), ‘Supporting headteachers in implementing the school development plan (2.04 and 2.25), ‘Advising on the appointment of staff’ (2.00 and 2.27), ‘Advising on the design and equipping of new accommodation (1.57 and 2.27) and ‘Supporting and helping with staff development programmes’ (2.14 and 2.42). The largest negative differences between priorities and views of service were ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’ (2.68 and 2.22) and ‘Advising on provision for pupils with special needs’ (2.36 and 1.78).

Authority D had 16 items with a negative rating of scores more than 0.2 of a point apart. There were 4 items where the service rating was better than the priority rating by more than 0.21 of a point. These were ‘Providing reports on the work of teachers when required’ (1.77 and 2.11), ‘Advising on the design and equipping of new accommodation’ (1.54 and 1.87), ‘Advising on equipment and other resources’ (1.77 and 2.11) and ‘Helping the school to develop its plan for appraisal’ (2.39 and 2.55). ‘Advising on the appointment of staff’ (1.91 and 2.38) had a positive score (i.e. the service score above the priority score) of more than 0.4 of a point difference. The biggest negative discrepancies between priority and service scores were for ‘Supporting the head and senior staff in their management roles’ (2.44 and 1.93), ‘Providing advice on the management of the curriculum’ (2.26 and 1.81) and ‘Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection’ (2.72 and 1.67). In this context it was
interesting to note that this is the authority which has separated inspection and advice.

All 4 authorities showed a negative discrepancy of more than 0.2 for 'Advising on the provision for pupils with special needs' which was thirteenth in the overall order of priority.

All the authorities had positive scores on 'Advising on the appointment of staff', 'Providing reports on the work of teachers when required' and on 'Advising on the design and equipping of new accommodation.' However, these were items where the priority ratings were at the bottom end of the list and scores were therefore low and this made it more likely that the service scores would exceed them.

The first item on the priority list 'Discussing work both before and after inspection' was the same for service and priority in authority A but scores were negative in the other 3 authorities. Other items where 3 or more authorities had negative scores of more than 0.2 of a point were 'Monitoring the standards of learning and teaching', (7th in priorities), 'Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum' (3rd in priorities), 'Working collaboratively with headteachers' (9th in priorities), and 'Supporting the school in helping teachers experiencing difficulty' (14th in priorities).
### COMPARISON OF HEADTEACHERS' PRIORITIES AND THEIR VIEWS OF THE ADVISORY SERVICE IN AUTHORITY A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Headteachers' Priorities</th>
<th>Headteachers' View of Advisory Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Evaluating the work of the school through inspection and other visits</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Monitoring the standards of learning and teaching</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Giving positive and negative feedback</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Giving heads opportunity for preliminary explanations pre-inspection</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>Discussing work both before and after inspection</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Giving positive and negative feedback</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>Providing verbal reports</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>Providing written reports</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12</td>
<td>Giving heads opportunity for preliminary explanations pre-inspection</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14</td>
<td>Giving positive and negative feedback</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>Giving positive and negative feedback</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13</td>
<td>Providing verbal reports</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E16</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E18</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E19</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E20</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E21</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E22</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E23</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E25</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E26</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E27</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E28</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E29</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E30</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E31</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E32</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E33</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E34</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E35</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E36</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E37</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E38</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E39</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E40</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures represent the average score per item.
## COMPARISON OF HEADTEACHERS' PRIORITIES AND THEIR VIEWS OF THE ADVISORY SERVICE IN AUTHORITY B

*Fig 7.3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Headteachers' priorities</th>
<th>Headteachers' view of advisory service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1 Evaluating the work of the school through inspection and other visits</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Monitoring the standards of learning and teaching</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Giving positive and negative feedback</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Identifying shortcomings in the school</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 Discussing work both before and after inspection</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7 Providing verbal reports</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8 Providing written reports</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9 Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10 Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11 Advising on provision for learning and teaching</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12 Advising on provision for pupils with special needs</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13 Advising on making the school development plan</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14 Supporting headteachers in implementing the school development plan</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15 Supporting the head and senior staff in their management roles</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16 Providing advice on the management of the curriculum</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17 Working collaboratively with headteachers</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D18 Helping headteachers to analyse problems</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D19 Working collaboratively with governors</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D20 Advising on the appointment of staff</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D21 Providing reports on the work of teachers when required</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D22 Supporting the school in helping teachers experiencing difficulty</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D23 Advising on the design and equipping of new accommodation</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D24 Advising on equipment and other resources</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D25 Supporting and helping with staff development programmes</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D26 Helping the school to develop its plan for appraisal</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures represent the average score per item
## COMPARISON OF HEADTEACHERS' PRIORITIES AND THEIR VIEWS OF THE ADVISORY SERVICE IN AUTHORITY C

**Fig 7.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Headteachers' priorities</th>
<th>Headteachers' view of advisory service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D18</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D19</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D20</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D21</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D22</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D23</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D24</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D25</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D26</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D27</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D28</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures represent the average score per item.
### COMPARISON OF HEADTEACHERS' PRIORITIES AND THEIR VIEWS OF THE ADVISORY SERVICE IN AUTHORITY D

**Fig. 7.5**

| D1 | Evaluating the work of the school through inspection and other visits | 2.60 |
| D2 | Monitoring the standards of learning and teaching | 2.49 |
| D5 | Identifying shortcomings in the school | 2.42 |
| D6 | Giving positive and negative feedback | 2.58 |
| D7 | Giving heads opportunity for preliminary explanations pre-inspection | 2.67 |
| D8 | Discussing work both before and after inspection | 2.74 |
| D9 | Providing verbal reports | 2.60 |
| D10 | Providing written reports | 2.60 |
| D11 | Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection | 2.72 |
| E9 | Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum | 1.67 |
| E10 | Supporting teaching dealing with assessment | 2.24 |
| E11 | Advising on provision for learning and teaching | 2.51 |
| E12 | Advising on provision for pupils with special needs | 2.33 |
| E13 | Advising on provision for pupils with special needs | 2.67 |
| E14 | Supporting headteachers in making the school development plan | 2.05 |
| E15 | Supporting headteachers in implementing the school development plan | 2.19 |
| E16 | Supporting the head and senior staff in their management roles | 2.44 |
| E17 | Supporting the head and senior staff in their management roles | 2.26 |
| E18 | Supporting headteachers in making the school development plan | 1.81 |
| E19 | Supporting headteachers in implementing the school development plan | 2.09 |
| E20 | Supporting the head and senior staff in their management roles | 2.33 |
| E21 | Supporting the head and senior staff in their management roles | 2.07 |
| E22 | Supporting the head and senior staff in their management roles | 1.54 |
| E23 | Advising on the design and equipping of new accommodation | 2.33 |
| E24 | Advising on equipment and other resources | 1.87 |
| F11 | Supporting and helping with staff development programmes | 2.11 |
| F12 | Helping the school to develop its plan for appraisal | 2.55 |

The figures represent the average score per item.

- Headteachers' priorities
- Headteachers' view of advisory service
COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES IN SCORES BETWEEN HEADTEACHERS’ PRIORITIES AND THEIR VIEWS OF THE SERVICE THEY RECEIVE

Fig 7.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position in priorities</th>
<th>Authority A</th>
<th>Authority B</th>
<th>Authority C</th>
<th>Authority D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+0.41</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>+0.41</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
<td>+0.41</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>+0.41</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dark horizontal lines divide statements from the different sets of criteria
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Headteachers priorities for the work of advisory teachers

Headteachers were also asked to give priorities for the work on advisory teachers in 8 tasks and activities, ticking one of 3 columns as for the questionnaire on advisers. The questionnaire was scored in a similar way.

This showed considerable unanimity about what headteachers want from advisory teachers. Secondary school headteachers differed from primary headteachers in wanting less emphasis on ‘Advising on provision for learning and teaching’ and ‘Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection’ and greater emphasis on ‘Supporting and helping with staff development programmes’ and ‘Advising on equipment and other resources.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEADTEACHERS ORDER OF PRIORITY FOR THE TASKS AND ACTIVITIES OF ADVISORY TEACHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fig 7.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9 Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10 Supporting teaching dealing with assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12 Advising on provision for pupils with special needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11 Advising on provision for learning and teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11 Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E22 Supporting the school in helping teachers experiencing difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11 Supporting and helping with staff development programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24 Advising on equipment and other resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Services which headteachers would buy from advisory teachers

In the two authorities where this question was asked there was complete unanimity about the order of the replies. The combined order was as follows:

1. 44 (62%)  Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum
2. 40 (56%)  Supporting teaching dealing with assessment
3. 34 (48%)  Supporting and helping with staff development programmes
4. 33 (46%)  Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection
5. 30 (42%)  Advising on provision for pupils with special needs
6. 27 (38%)  Advising on provision for learning and teaching
7. 26 (37%)  Supporting the school in helping teachers experiencing difficulty
8. 23 (32%)  Advising on equipment and other resources
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# COMPARISON OF HEADTEACHERS' PRIORITIES AND THEIR VIEWS OF ADVISORY TEACHERS

**Fig 7.8**

## AUTHORITY A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Authority A</th>
<th>Authority B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E22</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures represent the average score per item.
## COMPARISON OF HEADTEACHERS' PRIORITIES AND THEIR VIEWS OF ADVISORY TEACHERS

**Fig 7.9**

### AUTHORITY C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>Supporting teaching dealing with assessment</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>Advising on provision for learning and teaching</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>Advising on provision for pupils with special needs</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E22</td>
<td>Supporting the school in helping teachers experiencing difficulty</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24</td>
<td>Advising on equipment and other resources</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11</td>
<td>Supporting and helping with staff development programmes</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AUTHORITY D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>Supporting teaching dealing with assessment</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>Advising on provision for learning and teaching</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>Advising on provision for pupils with special needs</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E22</td>
<td>Supporting the school in helping teachers experiencing difficulty</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24</td>
<td>Advising on equipment and other resources</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11</td>
<td>Supporting and helping with staff development programmes</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures represent the average score per item.
Comparison of headteachers’ priorities and their views of advisory teachers

Headteachers’ priorities for the service and their views of the service they received were compared in a similar way to the comparison for advisers. Here too, the items marked ‘service not used’ were compensated for in the calculations.

In all 4 authorities the picture was less good than it was for advisers with only 25% of items where the service score was as good or better than the priority score compared with 34% for advisers. There were 31% of scores within 0.2 of a point of each other for advisory teachers compared with 41% for advisers.

In authority A 5 of the 8 items were within 0.2 of a point of each other and for 2 of these ‘Advising on equipment and other resources’ (2.14 and 2.22) and ‘Supporting and helping with staff development programmes’ (2.29 and 2.31) the service score was above the priority score. There was a negative difference of 0.21 or more for ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’ (2.79 and 2.42) and ‘Supporting teaching dealing with assessment’ (2.59 and 2.22) and ‘Advising on provision for pupils with special needs’ had a service score of more than 0.4 below the priority score (2.59 and 1.89).

Authority B had 2 items where the scores were within 0.2 of each other and one where the service score was more than 0.4 in advance of the priority score (Advising on equipment...
and other resources (1.68 and 2.41). The service score was also in advance of the priority score for ‘Advising on provision for learning and teaching’ (2.24 and 2.40) and ‘Supporting and helping with staff development programmes’ (2.28 and 2.32). The largest negative difference was for ‘Advising on provision for pupils with special needs’ (2.44 and 1.85).

In authority C there were 2 items where the scores were within 0.2 of each other and two more where the service scores were more than 0.2 in advance of the priority scores. The items with positive scores were ‘Advising on equipment and other resources’ (1.83 and 2.21) and ‘Supporting and helping with staff development programmes’ (1.79 and 2.12). The largest negative differences were for ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’ (2.76 and 2.22), ‘Supporting teaching dealing with assessment’ (2.72 and 2.36) and ‘Advising on provision for pupils with special needs’ (2.28 and 1.75).

In authority D only one item had scores within 0.2 of a point of each other and this was one where the service score exceeded the priority score. It was ‘Advising on equipment and other resources’ (2.12 and 2.19). In no other case did the service score exceed the priority score. The largest negative difference was for ‘Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection’ (2.37 and 1.50). There was also a large negative difference for ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’ (2.77 and 2.13) and there were negative differences of more than 0.4 for ‘Advising on provision for learning and teaching’ (2.40 and 1.93) and ‘Advising on provision for pupils with special needs’ (2.62 and 2.17).

In all four authorities ‘Advising on provision for pupils with special needs’ showed a substantial negative difference between service and priorities as it did for advisers. Authority D showed a substantial negative difference for ‘Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection’ and C and D showed similar differences in ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’. All four scored well on ‘Advising on equipment and other resources’. ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’ was third in headteachers’ priorities; ‘Following up the findings of inspection’ was sixth.

Comments by headteachers on services they felt to be important

In each authority there were discussions with primary and secondary headteachers about their views of the advisory service they were receiving from inspectors, advisers and advisory teachers. Some of these views offer a useful comment on the kind of advisory service that headteachers would like.

Headteachers had fairly definite views about the way in which they wanted advisers and advisory teachers to work and about what they valued in the work that was being done in their authority. The emphasis generally was on seeing results from the adviser’s work and giving confidence and reassurance to teachers, particularly in present circumstances. There was also
a desire for genuine advice rather than too much emphasis on building on what teachers had to offer, while at the same time advising in context of the particular school or classroom.

An effective adviser, well, I think I'd need to respect intellectually and to convince myself of their intellectual competence and their specific competence in the area. They don't have to convince us that they could do our job, but they have to convince us that they understand the pressures on schools. And that they actually do tread that difficult tight rope between telling us what to do and backing off and being that sort of under-belly of progressive education that says, 'It's all coming from you. I'm just a facilitator.'

Secondary school headteacher, authority C

In fact our advisory teacher is the most superb sort of lynch pin for the schools. She works extremely hard. She's come in on SATs but went a lot further than just administrative/managerial arrangements. She's an extremely positive sort of person. The teachers relate very readily to her. They identify very easily and confidently with her.

Primary school headteacher, authority C

I'd like somebody to come in with a smile and leave behind some kind of seed and perhaps a watering can and buzz off, but as he buzzes off, leave my school with a smile on its face.

Primary school headteacher, authority C

I value greatly the analytical skills of our attached inspector. He writes extremely succinctly, I find, and to the point after review meetings and his ability to analyse situations objectively, I find extremely helpful.

Secondary school headteacher, authority A

There was evidence that views were gradually changing with an increasing demand for a consultancy approach.

If I were a client purchasing private services, you know, inspection and advice, I would be saying, "Fine, inspect my maths curriculum and I want my advice contained within this framework" and I would specify the way I wanted it so that I could use it. What I'm not getting as a client at the moment and do not see the offer of it, is that kind of system that I can pick up and run with.

Middle school headteacher, authority C

What I would like to purchase is a model similar to a management consultancy and the term consultancy I think, embodies what I'm looking for. The management consultant comes in as a critical friend, as very much more critical than friend and produces a very clear sighted report and recommendations which you can take or leave as your circumstances provide.

Primary school headteacher, authority C

Some headteachers made statements about particular areas of work in which they wanted help from advisers. The two most often referred to by both primary and secondary headteachers were support with specialist advice about curriculum and with personnel matters. Advice on the National Curriculum came third in the overall priorities but 'Advising on provision for teaching and learning' came seventeenth and 'Providing advice on the management of the curriculum' came nineteenth. It was also interesting to note that appointments, which were quoted more than once by secondary headteachers in discussion, came low in the list of priorities (22nd). Help with buildings and equipment which was at the bottom of the list was quoted by one headteacher as something on which he had welcomed advice. The help of the
adviser in reinforcing the overall development of the school was also mentioned. Headteachers wanted advisers or inspectors to act as a sounding board and as colleagues with whom they could discuss ideas. ‘Supporting the head and senior staff in their management roles’ came sixteenth in the priority list. There were also emergencies wanting the help of an adviser.

- a sounding board because I do find in headship that there’s so much change at the moment and I’m struggling with coming to terms with what’s the right direction, the vision which I have for the school, trying to clarify my own thinking on this and you can’t always take back to staff.

*Primary school headteacher, authority D*

From time to time, it may only happen every few years, you will want to dial 999 and at that particular point, sod link reviews and theme reviews and all the rest of it. They’ve got to down tools and attend to you. I feel very strongly about that.

*Secondary school headteacher, authority C*

I’d like to sit around with an adviser and get into a good debate on time management and how we’re supposed to handle the National Curriculum and do it properly so that each child gets its fair crack of the whip, so that teachers have freedom, so that teachers have some input from the outside.

*Primary school headteacher, authority C*

I’d like the adviser to get involved in teacher support to a much greater degree. I’m not just talking about teachers in professional difficulty. I’m talking about general teacher support to move everybody’s careers forward and professional support. I would like to get them involved in institutional planning which I think is probably the biggest challenge to headteachers because of its many facets and I think that’s possibly the area (where) we are going to have most difficulty.

*Primary school headteacher, authority C*

A number of headteachers spoke of staff feeling threatened by advisory visits. There was also a strongly held view in some places that it was essential that schools knew the purpose of any visit and that this made it less threatening. Headteachers were also aware of the extent to which different advisers were able to dispel or enhance the feeling of threat.

One of my members of staff looks at an inspector like a rabbit in front of the headlights.

*Primary school headteacher, authority D*

In our case we have an inspector who is not good at that aspect (communication and interpersonal skills). He seems to have the effect on staff where they are not at all sure, because he does not seem to have the gift to put them at ease, to make them feel comfortable and it’s very much ‘I am here in an inspectorial role’ and that doesn’t make people feel comfortable and it doesn’t help relationships.

*Primary school headteacher, authority D*

I do feel that people need to know where they stand, what is going to be expected of them, because if the head isn’t sure, that then feeds itself down to the staff and they themselves want to know, ‘What are they coming in for?’ ‘What’s it all about?’ ‘Are they going to be looking at something?’ ‘Do I need to get this out?’ ‘How can I best make the morning productive?’

*Primary school headteacher, authority B*

I see a problem where you have an inspectorate service that on the one hand advise and on the other hand inspect and the same person may be doing both so that although they only be wearing one hat at a time but you know there is always the other hat that they can put on and so it has to be clearly defined prior to a visit whether they’re there in a pastoral or advisory capacity or whether it is actually inspectorial.

*Junior school headteacher, authority A*
Some primary headteachers were concerned about the credibility of advisers who came from a different sector. They also noted the credibility with teachers of advisory teachers.

There was a reorganisation and we had a new guy put at our disposal and when he came he was put to the test, in a respectful way. He was asked questions in the very first class he visited and he failed. And that went round the school and around the staffroom right away and damaged the credibility of that guy after that and there was no way I could rebuild.

*Primary school headteacher, authority C*

It isn’t desirable or acceptable in my opinion to have an inspector visiting our school who isn’t primary trained and doesn’t have much idea at all of the primary system. In fact, I feel we’re training him which is not our role and it is not satisfactory at all.

*Primary school headteacher, authority D*

Their credibility (advisory teachers) is usually one of coming from a class - they’ve had class teaching experience and it’s very much that they’re coming to help me as a teacher, support my ability within the classroom and to provide fresh eyes and input in very practical terms.

*Primary school headteacher, authority C*

**The priorities and views of teachers**

*Priorities in the work of inspectors and advisers*

Teachers were given questionnaires with tasks and activities listed which stemmed from the effectiveness criteria but were different in a few respects from those for headteachers to make them more relevant to the work of the classroom. The questionnaires referring to advisers on the one hand and advisory teachers on the other, were separated. These questionnaires were sent to the same 100 randomly selected schools as for headteachers, leaving the headteachers to decide which teachers should reply. Scoring was similar to that for headteachers. The ranking for the four authorities, for primary and secondary schools separately and the ranking overall is given below.

There were some interesting differences between primary and secondary schools here. Secondary school teachers placed National Curriculum work at the top of their list whereas for primary school teachers it was seventh. Secondary school teachers also rated in-service provision at a lower level and the provision of advice on special needs, which could be because secondary school normally have teachers who are specialists in the special needs field. Secondary school teachers also rated inspection more highly at seventh as compared with seventeenth place for primary schools.

‘Challenging situations’ was not understood by many teachers who commented on this in the questionnaires. This may account for its low placing.
### TEACHERS' ORDER OF PRIORITY FOR THE TASKS AND ACTIVITIES OF ADVISERS AND INSPECTORS

**Fig 7.11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall order</th>
<th>Authority A</th>
<th>Authority B</th>
<th>Authority C</th>
<th>Authority D</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Making constructive comments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9</td>
<td>Providing effective in-service courses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Discussing work with teachers before and after inspection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Planning and organising courses effectively</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Providing advice and guidance on work seen</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>Supporting teachers dealing with assessment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>Giving positive and negative feedback</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>Giving teachers opportunity for preliminary explanation pre-inspection</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Monitoring standards of learning and teaching</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>Recommending appropriate resources</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>Advising on learning and teaching</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>Advising on the use of resources for teaching and learning</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Evaluating the work of the school through inspection</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Helping teachers to identify and set achievable targets</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>Helping teachers to think through ideas</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Observing teachers at work in the classroom</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Helping teachers to plan their work</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Monitoring standards of learning and teaching</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Challenging situations</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparison of teachers' priorities and their views of advisers**

Teachers, like headteachers, were asked to give their priorities for the work of the advisory team against a list of criteria and their views of the advisers against the same criteria. These were compared and this comparison is shown on the next pages.

Overall teachers were more critical of advisers than headteachers. Whereas there were 34% of items in the headteachers' list where the service score was above the priority score there were only 11% of such items in the teachers' list.

In authority A the scores for priority and service showed 14 of the 22 items within 0.2 points of each other of which 4 showed a higher score for service than for priority. These were ‘Evaluating the school through inspection’ (2.40 and 2.47), ‘Observing teachers at work in
the classroom’ (2.24 and 2.28), ‘Monitoring classroom work’ (2.07 and 2.19) and ‘Identifying shortcomings’ (2.29 and 2.45). In addition ‘Challenging situations’ was over 0.4 of a point above the priority score (1.48 and 1.96) but as has already been explained, this was not understood by teachers. These scores suggest that this authority was making a favourable impression on teachers with some parts of their inspection programme. Less good were the scores for ‘Providing advice and guidance on work seen’ (2.74 and 2.10), ‘Making constructive comments’ (2.76 and 2.30) and ‘Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs (2.50 and 1.91). The discussions with teachers suggested that these areas were very important from their point of view and this was confirmed by the fact that they achieved high scores in the priority table.

In authority B 6 items had scores within 0.2 of a point of each other and 2 had scores where the service score was above the priority score. These were ‘Monitoring classroom work’ (1.82 and 1.87) and ‘Helping teachers to plan their work’ (2.07 and 2.13). Other items where the scores were close were ‘Evaluating the work of the school through inspection’ (2.18 and 2.09) and ‘Challenging situations’ (1.82 and 1.77). There were 12 items where the service scores were 0.4 or more of a point below the priority scores. Those with the largest differences were were ‘Giving teachers opportunity for preliminary explanation pre-inspection’ (2.50 and 1.75), ‘Discussing work with teachers before and after inspection’ (2.64 and 1.91), Providing advice and guidance on work seen’ (2.54 and 1.88), ‘Supporting work in the National Curriculum’ (2.93 and 2.08), ‘Supporting teachers dealing with assessment’ (2.75 and 2.00), ‘Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs’ (2.50 and 1.54) and ‘Providing effective in-service courses’ (2.82 and 2.15).

In authority C, 4 items were within 0.2 of a point of each other and one of these had a service score above the priority score. This was ‘Challenging situations’ (1.80 and 1.83). Other items where the scores were close were ‘Observing teachers at work in the classroom’ (2.32 and 2.31), ‘Giving teachers opportunity for preliminary explanation pre-inspection’ (2.48 and 2.36) and ‘Planning and organising courses effectively’ (2.64 and 2.63). However, the comparable item on courses ‘Providing effective in-service courses’ had scores which were 0.4 or more of a point apart (2.80 and 2.09). There were 12 other items where the scores were 0.4 or more of a point apart. Among the largest differences in scores were were ‘Making constructive comments’ (2.84 and 2.21), ‘Helping teachers to identify and set achievable targets’ (2.48 and 1.87), ‘Advising on the use of resources for learning and teaching’ (2.48 and 1.80), ‘Supporting teaching dealing with assessment’ (2.60 and 1.95) and ‘Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs’ (2.64 and 1.80).

Authority D had 6 items within 0.2 of a point of each other of which two had service scores in advance of their priority scores. These were ‘Providing effective in-service courses’ (2.32 and 2.37) and ‘Challenging situations’ (1.71 and 1.82). Another close score was for
'Identifying shortcomings' (2.18 and 2.11). Nine items had negative scores which were more than 0.4 points apart. The largest differences were for 'Discussing work with teachers before and after inspection' (2.68 and 1.95), 'Making constructive comments' (2.85 and 2.26) and 'Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs' (2.62 and 2.00) and 'Planning and organising courses effectively' (2.79 and 2.17).

These scores suggest that none of four teams was doing particularly well in the eyes of teachers although authority A was somewhat better than the others. Generally speaking scores were better for the inspection side of the work than for the support and advice. Score differences for the items which were seen as more valuable by teachers tended to be higher and negative. 'Discussing work before and after inspection' (3rd in priorities) had negative differences of more than 0.2 of a point for all authorities and more than 0.4 of a point for 3 of them. Similarly 'Making constructive comments' (1st in priorities) also had negative differences of more than 0.2 of a point for all four and more than 0.4 for 3 of them. Other items which scored badly were 'Supporting teachers dealing with assessment' (6th in priorities) and 'Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs' (9th in priorities) which had differences of more than 0.4 from all 4 authorities. 'Providing effective in-service courses' (2nd in priorities) had a difference of less than 0.2 of a point in only one case and differences of more than 0.2 in one other and 0.4 in the remaining 2.

'Challenging situations' was a service which compared well with the priority rating, but it has to be remembered that a number of teachers noted on the questionnaire that they did not understand this item. Priority scores were low for this so it was not surprising that service scores exceeded them.

Overall this analysis suggested that these 4 teams were not meeting the priorities of the teachers very well.
### COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' PRIORITIES AND THEIR VIEWS OF THE ADVISORY SERVICE IN AUTHORITY A

**Fig 7.12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Teachers' Priorities</th>
<th>Teachers' View of Advisory Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1 Evaluating the work of the school through inspection</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Monitoring standards of learning and teaching</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Observing teachers at work in the classroom</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Monitoring classroom work</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Identifying shortcomings</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 Giving positive and negative feedback</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7 Giving teachers opportunity for preliminary explanation pre-inspection</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8 Discussing work with teachers before and after inspection</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Providing advice and guidance on work seen</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Making constructive comments</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3 Helping teachers to plan their work</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4 Helping teachers to identify and set achievable targets</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5 Challenging situations</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6 Helping teachers to think through ideas</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7 Recommending appropriate resources</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8 Advising on the use of resources for teaching and learning</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9 Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10 Supporting teachers dealing with assessment</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11 Advising on learning and teaching</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12 Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9 Providing effective in-service courses</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10 Planning and organising courses effectively</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures represent the average score per item.
### COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' PRIORITIES AND THEIR VIEWS OF THE ADVISORY SERVICE IN AUTHORITY B

Fig 7.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D1</th>
<th>Evaluating the work of the school through inspection</th>
<th>2.18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Monitoring standards of learning and teaching</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Observing teachers at work in the classroom</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Monitoring classroom work</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Identifying shortcomings</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>Giving positive and negative feedback</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>Giving teachers opportunity for preliminary explanation pre-inspection</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Discussing work with teachers before and after inspection</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Providing advice and guidance on work seen</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Making constructive comments</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Helping teachers to plan their work</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Helping teachers to identify and set achievable targets</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Challenging situations</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>Helping teachers to think through ideas</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>Recommending appropriate resources</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>Advising on the use of resources for teaching and learning</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>Supporting teachers dealing with assessment</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>Advising on learning and teaching</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9</td>
<td>Providing effective in-service courses</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Planning and organising courses effectively</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures represent the average score per item

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers' priorities</th>
<th>Teachers' view of the advisory service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' PRIORITIES AND THEIR VIEWS OF THE ADVISORY SERVICE IN AUTHORITY C

**Fig 7.14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers' priorities</th>
<th>Teachers' view of the advisory service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1 Evaluating the work of the school through inspection</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Monitoring standards of learning and teaching</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Observing teachers at work in the classroom</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Monitoring classroom work</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Identifying shortcomings</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 Giving positive and negative feedback</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7 Giving teachers opportunity for preliminary explanation pre-inspection</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8 Discussing work with teachers before and after inspection</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Providing advice and guidance on work seen</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Making constructive comments</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3 Helping teachers to plan their work</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4 Helping teachers to identify and set achievable targets</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5 Challenging situations</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6 Helping teachers to think through ideas</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7 Recommending appropriate resources</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8 Advising on the use of resources for teaching and learning</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9 Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10 Supporting teachers dealing with assessment</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11 Advising on learning and teaching</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12 Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9 Providing effective in-service courses</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10 Planning and organising courses effectively</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures represent the average score per item.
### COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' PRIORITIES
### AND THEIR VIEWS OF THE
### ADVISORY SERVICE IN AUTHORITY D

**Fig 7.15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Teachers' Priorities</th>
<th>Teachers' View of the Advisory Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1 Evaluating the work of the school through inspection</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Monitoring standards of learning and teaching</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Observing teachers at work in the classroom</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Monitoring classroom work</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Identifying shortcomings</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 Giving positive and negative feedback</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7 Giving teachers opportunity for preliminary explanation pre-inspection</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8 Discussing work with teachers before and after inspection</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Providing advice and guidance on work seen</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Making constructive comments</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3 Helping teachers to plan their work</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4 Helping teachers to identify and set achievable targets</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5 Challenging situations</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6 Helping teachers to think through ideas</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7 Recommending appropriate resources</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8 Advising on the use of resources for teaching and learning</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9 Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10 Supporting teachers dealing with assessment</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11 Advising on learning and teaching</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12 Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9 Providing effective in-service courses</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10 Planning and organising courses effectively</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures represent the average score per item.

---

* Teachers' priorities
* Teachers' view of the advisory service
### COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES IN SCORES BETWEEN TEACHERS’ PRIORITIES AND THEIR VIEWS OF THE SERVICE THEY RECEIVE FROM ADVISERS AND INSPECTORS

Fig 7.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>Service Score</th>
<th>Priority Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ 0.2 - 0.2</td>
<td>Above priority score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 0.21 - 0.4</td>
<td>Between 0.21 and 0.4 above priority score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 0.41 - 0.4</td>
<td>0.41 or more above priority score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 0.2 - 0.2</td>
<td>Below priority score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
<td>Between 0.21 and 0.4 below priority score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 0.41 - 0.4</td>
<td>0.41 or more below priority score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position in priorities</th>
<th>Authority A</th>
<th>Authority B</th>
<th>Authority C</th>
<th>Authority D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>+ 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>- 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>+ 0.21 - 0.4</td>
<td>- 0 - 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>- 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>- 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>+ 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>- 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>- 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>- 0 - 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>+ 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>+ 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>+ 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.41 +</td>
<td>- 0.41 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>- 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>+ 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>- 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>+ 0.41</td>
<td>- 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>+ 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>+ 0 - 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>- 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>- 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>- 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0 - 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>- 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>- 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.21 - 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>- 0 - 0.2</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0.41</td>
<td>- 0 - 0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teachers' priorities for the work of advisory teachers

Teachers were asked to assess the priority they would give to 14 tasks and activities undertaken by advisory teachers by ticking in one of 3 columns as for advisers.

There were considerable differences between primary and secondary schools here. Primary schools placed the organisation of courses at second place and secondary schools put it at twelfth place. Help with the National Curriculum came in at third place for primary
schools and ninth place for secondary schools. Primary schools rated advice on the use of resources much more highly than secondary schools - at fifth rather than twelfth place but planning, constructive comments and advice on learning and teaching all came lower for primary than for secondary schools.

### TEACHERS' ORDER OF PRIORITY FOR THE TASKS AND ACTIVITIES OF ADVISORY TEACHERS

**Fig 7.17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Authority A</th>
<th>Authority B</th>
<th>Authority C</th>
<th>Authority D</th>
<th>Primary schs</th>
<th>Secondary schs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing effective in-service courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and organising courses effectively</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping teachers to think through ideas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting teachers dealing with assessment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping teachers to identify and set achievable targets</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising on the use of resources for teaching and learning</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing advice and guidance on work seen</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping teachers to plan their work</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making constructive comments</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommending appropriate resources</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising on learning and teaching</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging situations</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of teachers' priorities and their views of advisory teachers

Teachers were also asked to give their views about the service offered by advisory teachers and this was compared with their priorities. The next 5 pages give this comparison for each of the 4 authorities.

Overall teachers' views of advisory teachers compared with their priorities were rather more favourable than those for advisers. There were 16% of scores where the service score was above the priority score compared with 11% for advisers and 44% of scores where the scores were within 0.2 of a point of each other as compared with 34% for advisers. This was the reverse of the views of headteachers who rated advisers above advisory teachers. This probably simply reflects the contacts of each group. It makes the loss of advisory teachers noted in chapter 5 even more of a matter for concern.
COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' PRIORITIES AND THEIR VIEWS OF ADVISORY TEACHERS

Fig 7.18

AUTHORITY A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Teachers' Priorities</th>
<th>Teachers' Views of Advisory Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Providing advice and guidance on work seen</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Making constructive comments</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Helping teachers to plan their work</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Helping teachers to identify and set achievable targets</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Challenging situations</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>Helping teachers to think through ideas</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>Recommending appropriate resources</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>Advising on the use of resources for teaching and learning</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>Supporting teachers dealing with assessment</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>Advising on learning and teaching</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9</td>
<td>Providing effective in-service courses</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Planning and organising courses effectively</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers represent the average score per item
COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' PRIORITIES AND THEIR VIEWS OF ADVISORY TEACHERS

Fig 7.19

AUTHORITY B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Teachers' Priorities</th>
<th>Teachers' Views of Advisory Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Providing advice and guidance on work seen</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Making constructive comments</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Helping teachers to plan their work</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Helping teachers to identify and set achievable targets</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Challenging situations</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>Helping teachers to think through ideas</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>Recommending appropriate resources</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>Advising on the use of resources for teaching and learning</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>Supporting teachers dealing with assessment</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>Advising on learning and teaching</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9</td>
<td>Providing effective in-service courses</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Planning and organising courses effectively</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers represent the average score per item:

- Teachers' priorities
- Teachers' views of advisory teachers
COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' PRIORITIES
AND THEIR VIEWS OF ADVISORY TEACHERS

Fig 7.20

AUTHORITY C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E1 Providing advice and guidance on work seen</th>
<th>2.33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E2 Making constructive comments</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3 Helping teachers to plan their work</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4 Helping teachers to identify and set achievable targets</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5 Challenging situations</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6 Helping teachers to think through ideas</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7 Recommending appropriate resources</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8 Advising on the use of resources for teaching and learning</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9 Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10 Supporting teachers dealing with assessment</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11 Advising on learning and teaching</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12 Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9 Providing effective in-service courses</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10 Planning and organising courses effectively</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers represent the average score per item

--- Teachers' priorities
--- Teachers' views of advisory teachers
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Fig 7.21

#### AUTHORITY D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Teachers' Priorities</th>
<th>Teachers' Views of Advisory Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Providing advice and guidance on work seen</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Making constructive comments</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Helping teachers to plan their work</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Helping teachers to identify and set achievable targets</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Challenging situations</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>Helping teachers to think through ideas</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>Recommending appropriate resources</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>Advising on the use of resources for teaching and learning</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>Supporting teachers dealing with assessment</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>Advising on learning and teaching</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9</td>
<td>Providing effective in-service courses</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Planning and organising courses effectively</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers represent the average score per item.

---

The diagram compares teachers' priorities and their views of advisory teachers using a scale from 0 to 3.00. The numbers represent the average score per item.
### COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCES IN SCORES BETWEEN TEACHERS’ PRIORITIES AND THEIR VIEWS OF THE SERVICE THEY RECEIVE FROM ADVISORY TEACHERS

**Fig 7.22**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Authority A</th>
<th>Authority B</th>
<th>Authority C</th>
<th>Authority D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>The same score for both priority and service</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+0.0-0.2</td>
<td>The service score 0. - 0.2 above the priority score</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+0.21-0.4</td>
<td>The service score between 0.21 and 0.4 above the priority score</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+0.41+</td>
<td>The service score 0.41 or more above the priority score</td>
<td>+0.41</td>
<td>+0.41</td>
<td>+0.41</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position in priorities</th>
<th>Authority A</th>
<th>Authority B</th>
<th>Authority C</th>
<th>Authority D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| E1 | Providing advice and guidance on work seen | 9 | -0.2 | +0.2 | -0.2 | -0.21 | -0.4 |
| E2 | Making constructive comments | 11 | -0.2 | -0.2 | +0.2 | -0.21 | -0.4 |
| E3 | Helping teachers to plan their work | 10 | -0.2 | -0.2 | +0.2 | -0.21 | -0.4 |
| E4 | Helping teachers to identify and set achievable targets | 6 | -0.2 | +0.21 | -0.21 | -0.41 |
| E5 | Challenging situations | 14 | +0.41 | +0.41 | +0.41 | -0.21 | -0.4 |
| E6 | Helping teachers to think through ideas | 2 | -0.2 | +0.2 | -0.21 | -0.4 |
| E7 | Recommending appropriate resources | 11 | -0.2 | -0.2 | +0.21 | -0.21 | -0.4 |
| E8 | Advising on the use of resources for teaching and learning | 7 | -0.2 | -0.2 | +0.21 | -0.21 | -0.4 |
| E9 | Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum | 4 | -0.2 | +0.21 | -0.21 | -0.41 | -0.21 |
| E10 | Supporting teachers dealing with assessment | 4 | +0.41 | +0.41 | +0.41 | -0.41 | -0.21 |
| E11 | Advising on learning and teaching | 13 | -0.2 | -0.2 | +0.21 | -0.21 | -0.41 |
| E12 | Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs | 8 | +0.41 | -0.41 | +0.41 | -0.41 |
| F9 | Providing effective in-service courses | 1 | -0.2 | -0.2 | +0.41 | -0.41 | -0.41 |
| F10 | Planning and organising courses effectively | 2 | -0.2 | -0.2 | -0.41 | -0.41 |

In authority A 11 items of the 14 were less than 0.2 of a point apart and one of these had a higher score for service than for priority. This was ‘Advising on learning and teaching’ (2.15 and 2.25). ‘Challenging situations’ had a service score of more than 0.4 of point ahead of the priority score. Two items had service scores of more than 0.4 of a point below the priority scores. They were ‘Supporting teachers dealing with assessment’ (2.65 and 2.12) and ‘Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs’ (2.50 and 1.94).

Authority B had 9 of the 14 items with less than 0.2 of a point difference of which 3 had a service score above the priority score and 1 had a similar score. The three where the service score was higher were ‘Providing advice and guidance on work seen’ (2.45 and 2.48), ‘Challenging situations’ (1.96 and 2.16) and ‘Helping teachers to think through ideas’ (2.33 and 2.52). ‘Advising on learning and teaching’ had the same score, 2.25, for both service and
priority. Those which had service scores more than 0.2 of a point below the priority score were ‘Helping teachers to identify and set achievable targets’ (2.75 and 2.43), ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’ (2.71 and 2.48) and ‘Supporting teaching dealing with assessment’ (2.54 and 2.22). ‘Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs’ (2.17 and 1.76) had a service score of more than 0.4 of a point below the priority score.

Authority C had 3 items which were less than 0.2 of a point apart of which 2, ‘Making constructive comments’ (2.37 and 2.38) and ‘Helping teachers to plan their work’ (2.13 and 2.16) had a service score which was higher than the priority score. ‘Challenging situations’ (1.71 and 2.00) had a service score which was more than 0.2 of a point above the priority score. Seven sets of scores had negative scores by 0.2 of a point or more and 3 had service scores more than 0.4 of a point below the priority scores. These were ‘Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs’ (2.37 and 1.74), ‘Providing effective in-service courses’ (2.75 and 2.09) and ‘Planning and organising courses effectively’ (2.62 and 2.04).

Authority D also had 2 items which were less than 0.2 of a point apart and both had service scores higher than priority scores. These were ‘Challenging situations’ (1.83 and 1.94) and ‘Helping teachers to think through ideas’ (2.34 and 2.38). Eight items had service scores of 0.2 or more of a point below their priority scores and 4 items had service scores of more than 0.4 of a point below the priority scores. These were ‘Supporting teachers dealing with assessment’ (2.76 and 2.30), ‘Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs’ (2.76 and 2.19), ‘Providing effective in-service courses’ (2.86 and 2.31) ‘Planning and organising courses effectively’ (2.86 and 2.19).

Here again all 4 authorities showed negative differences between the 2 scores for special needs (8th in priorities). All 4 had service scores of 0.4 or more below the priority scores. ‘Supporting teachers dealing with assessment’ (4th in priorities) had a negative difference of more than 0.4 for authorities A and D and more than 0.2 for the other 2 authorities. The two items at the top of the priority list, ‘Providing effective in-service courses’ and ‘Planning and organising courses effectively’ did badly in authorities C and D with negative difference scores of more than 0.41. The evidence from the interviews was that the advisory teachers were increasingly taking over in-service education so these scores are a matter for concern.

Comments by teachers on services they felt to be important

Fewer teachers than headteachers were interviewed and those interviews which took place were primarily to discuss the teachers’ experience of inspection. However, there were some relevant comments in the questionnaires as well as in the interviews, some with wider implications.
Much concern that advisers rely too heavily on teachers’ own experience. Many teachers feel bewildered at the current rate of change and are looking for a strong lead. If advisers rely on teachers’ own experience, teachers feel let down, pointless in attending the course.

*Primary school teacher, authority C*

Advisory teachers are of value in the school because they work alongside the teacher and provide good support.

*Primary school teacher, authority B*

There were not many comments about what teachers wanted from advisory staff. The comments that were made could be summed up as ‘practical help for the classroom’.

More informal visits in school, with chances for observation, discussion and advice in situ about concrete situations would be greatly appreciated.

*Primary school teacher, authority C*

New technology I think. Speaking for myself, it’s an area that I never thought I would have to teach as much as we are going to and I feel fairly ill-equipped and I would welcome any help and advice and I think a lot of primary teachers feel that way as well.

*Primary school teacher, authority A*

I think practical ideas that you can use in the classroom, good resources, things that actually work in the classroom and sort of lesson strategies and the organisational aspect.

*Primary school teacher, authority A*

Several teachers commented on things which had happened which they felt exemplified good advisory practice or the good practice they would like to have.

They really understood our school and saw what we were doing, what we felt and what our ethos was and that was nice. When we talked to them afterwards we got feedback.

*Lower school teacher, authority D*

I think it’s a very good idea to have a little bit of a boost on the subject now and then because you can get rather stale and they come in and they’ve got all sorts of ideas and you go away and say, “Ooh that’s good, you know, I’ll do that” and then perhaps in a couple of months have a different subject in and the same thing.

*Primary school teacher, authority A*

I’ve found it helpful (visits from advisers) and I’ve taken on board what has been said. And I’ve found it confidence building in that they’ve been saying, ‘What you’re doing’s fine.’

*Primary school teacher, authority A*

One adviser was absolutely spot on. ....The most valuable thing was helping to plan and organise with the hindsight of her experience. There was time for feedback, questions help etc. Another adviser didn’t really give clear enough objectives and consequently the planning for him to come in was difficult because he spoke in such vague terms.

*Primary school teacher, authority C*

Advisers and inspectors and to some extent advisory teachers are likely to be regarded critically by teachers and tested out for their ability to advise appropriately for age groups they are visiting.
Many of the inspectors and advisers I have encountered have little experience of nursery education. Those who are involved in early years work and enthusiastic and helpful and they engender enthusiasm within the school. However, I feel that many of the inspectors and advisers have little idea of the general philosophy of nursery education and the practicalities of working with fives and under.

*Nursery school teacher, authority D*

I think it’s got to be someone who relates to your normal everyday teaching practice. Sometimes you feel, ‘Yes, that’s all very well for you to say, but would it work in the real world?’ I think you’ve got to be clear that they are thinking of the practical daily thirty five children as well.

*Primary school teacher, authority A*

They tend to get very involved in their subject and it’s all very well but when you have to teach everything else as well, sometimes it’s hard to address everything they’d like to see going on.

*Primary school teacher, authority D*

So many advisers and inspectors are specialists in their field they seem unaware of the demands placed on teachers of young children, who are expected to take on board all the ideas of the specialists, each of whom is unaware of what others in the advisory service are recommending.

*Nursery school teacher, authority D*

**Summary**

*Findings in relation to the questions asked*

1. Headteachers all rated inspection related activities highly. While this may be partly a matter of accepting that this is something which is going to happen anyway, the fact that it is not only inspection itself which is rated highly but all the activities related to it suggests that they are genuinely anxious to have this kind of service. Primary headteachers were also keen to have support in following up inspections. Sixty five per cent of headteachers overall would buy this service. Teachers placed inspection itself low in the list (14th) but ‘Making constructive comments’ is in first place.

2. As might be expected both headteachers and teachers placed ‘Support in developing the National Curriculum’ and its accompanying assessment highly. Headteachers place 3rd overall for advisers and 1st for advisory teachers. Teachers gave it a slightly less high rating than headteachers for work with advisers. (6th as compared with 3rd place) and placed it 4th for advisory teachers. It is therefore somewhat disturbing that these 2 items scored comparatively badly in the headteachers’ and teachers’ views of the service they received. This may be due to teachers’ own uncertainties making any help seem too little. It may also be due to the problem that information about developments in the National Curriculum often reaches advisers and advisory teachers too late to spend enough time developing good in-service provision. They also lack experience of teaching the National Curriculum. This will change as new people come into the service from teaching.
3 Teachers rated in-service provision highly and ‘Providing effective in-service courses’ came in second place for advisers and first place for advisory teachers in the teachers’ lists. Advising on special needs came about halfway down both lists for advisers and is below halfway for teachers’ priorities for advisory teachers but third in headteachers’ priorities for advisory teachers. These items did not achieve high scores for service.

4 ‘Supporting the school in helping teachers experiencing difficulty’ was lower than might be expected and was at fourteenth place in the headteachers’ lists.

5 Appointment of staff and advice on new buildings and equipment came low in all lists but were commented on fairly frequently in discussions with secondary headteachers.

6 Items which might be regarded as curriculum advice (e.g. Advising on provision for learning and teaching; Providing advice on the management of the curriculum) also came low in the lists of priorities but were the most frequently mentioned items for which advisory help would be welcomed in all the discussions.

7 Overall the items which had the least difference between priority and service scores tended to be those where the priority score was low.

8 Headteachers tended to rate advisers more highly than advisory teachers and teachers tended to do the reverse.

9 Although inspection per se was rated with service scores within 0.2 of a point of the priority scores by 2 of the 4 authorities for headteachers and 3 of the 4 by teachers, some of the associated activities which affected the school were less well thought of by the teachers in particular. Items such as ‘Discussing work before and after inspection’ ‘Making constructive comments’, ‘Providing advice and guidance on work seen’ showed large negative differences so far as the teachers were concerned in all 4 authorities. It might be concluded that while the actual inspection appeared to be going reasonably, the associated activities needed to be improved.

10 ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’ did badly with 3 of the 4 authorities with all groups. ‘Supporting teaching dealing with assessment’ did reasonably in the views of headteachers so far as advisers were concerned and rather less well with teachers for advisers. It did badly also for advisory teachers with both headteachers and teachers. This is a disturbing finding given the current importance of supporting schools in these 2 areas.
‘Advising on provision for pupils with special needs’ stood out as one item which was poorly rated by all groups in virtually every case. It came thirteenth in the priority list for headteachers and ninth for teachers. This is also disturbing, especially in view of legislation now going through which requires schools to have a policy which makes clear provision for pupils with special needs.

Teachers, in particular, rated the items on in-service education high in their priority list but there were some substantial negative differences between the priority and service scores for advisers and also in two authorities for advisory teachers.

Authority D which had separated inspection and advice generally did least well in the comparisons and in particular scores showed large negative differences for activities which involved the follow up to inspection. Headteachers also rated it poorly for inspection and for ‘Monitoring the standards of teaching and learning.’

Other findings
1 Headteachers were beginning to look towards a form of consultancy and to require this kind of service from the advisory team. At the same time, headteachers and teachers were looking for a lead from the advisory service. This has implication for the training of advisers and advisory teachers.

2 Some teachers felt threatened by the presence of advisers, particularly in the inspection role and this needs to be taken into account in planning inspections and other visits.

3 There was concern about the credibility of advisers who were experienced in a different sector of the education service. This also has implications for the training of advisers.

4 Teachers are looking for practical help in classroom practice from advisers and advisory teachers. They value the recent classroom experience of advisory teachers.

5 There was some evidence in discussion that headteachers would like more opportunities to discuss broader issues with advisers and inspectors.

6 Many of the comments by headteachers were concerned with the relationships which advisers and advisory teachers were able to form with them and with teachers.
8 THE KEY AREAS - INSPECTION

Introduction

The key areas for judging the effectiveness of an advisory team are inspection, advice and help and in-service education. Unless the team succeeds in these areas they cannot be regarded as successful. The other areas in the criteria list contribute to these areas.

Relevant literature

In September 1993 the first secondary schools will be inspected under the new arrangements for privatised inspection teams. In most parts of the country a number of schools have been prepared for this through inspection by their local authority advisory team and a few by inspection from HMI. A number of different patterns of inspection have been developed by local authorities and it seems a pity that the study of these has not preceded the implementation of the privatised system of inspection, because something might have been learned from them before adopting a version of the HMI system.

Maychell and Keys (1993) reviewed the various forms of inspection being used by local authority advisory teams and found that there were 6 different patterns: subject/thematic inspections which focused a particular subject or theme across a number of schools; inspection surveys in which the main purpose was to gather information for the authority to whom the report was addressed; selected whole school inspections in which certain schools were selected for particular reasons rather than as a rolling programme involving all schools; whole school inspections over a several year cycle; supported self-evaluation and various other types of inspection. For example, authority A in this study inspected a number of subject areas in secondary schools each year. Webster (1989, p.471) described the situation in Tameside where every school was asked first of all to request comment from students and parents on a range of issues related to its performance, then ‘to analyse the performance of all their students across a variety of curricular and extra curricula areas’ Finally an outside team would review the school’s self-analysis.

Maychell and Keys (1993) found that three fifths of the authorities replying to their questionnaire said that they carried out a regular programme of whole school inspections and a further 9 planned to introduce them. Over half of these also carried out ‘selected’ school inspections as well. In addition, a third of the authorities which did not have a full inspection programme carried out full inspections in some schools.

They also asked LEA personnel and headteachers for their views about the privatised inspection scheme proposed by the government. About three-quarters of the LEA respondents disagreed with the scheme and some 90% of headteachers. Forty two per cent of
headteachers said they would prefer inspection by their own LEA team because it had the advantage of being able to follow up inspections and knew the school’s history and local context.

Maychell and Keys (1993, p.59) found that headteachers, writing of local authority inspections, appreciated ‘the positive atmosphere which the inspection team had created, the objectivity and impartiality of the team, the opportunity to engage in future planning and the useful advice, information and ideas given by inspectors.’ They pointed out that if inspection was totally divorced from advice schools would lose some of the aspects of the present system which they most valued.

The Citizens Charter (1992 p.38) noted that ‘the average proportion of time that local schools’ inspectors spend in observing teaching is 18%. The highest quartile is over 36% and the lowest less than 6%’ It states: ‘There is a powerful stimulus to improvement when those outside a service are able to compare the performance of one body with that of others on a clear and consistent basis. Good external audit and inspection expose weaknesses. They confirm the reliability of good internal systems. They help to spread good practice, value for money and raise the quality of service.’

Wilcox (1988, p.12) suggested that ‘a new approach is needed which, instead of building up comprehensive pictures at particular points in time, establishes continuously evolving archives on them all’. He went on to suggest that these would consist of relevant documents and advisers’ reports and would be computer based.

McGee (1992, p.25) suggested that there were 3 main strands in inspection - compliance which he described as ‘checking whether what is provided meets statutory requirements as well as LEA and school policies’, improvement which was concerned with identifying where provision or achievement was less than might be anticipated. The third strand was validation. He suggested that the first purpose of validation was to check whether the school development plan was a sound basis for a contract with the LEA for the provision of education and the second purpose was that of validating claims made by the school about its performance.

Mann (1990) reporting on a seminar, noted that Wilcox suggested that inspection was a way of generating knowledge about the system and was one way in which outsiders could evaluate what was happening. Inspection took place in a natural setting and built on existing tacit knowledge, making use of qualitative methods such as observation and interview. If this process was to be credible, it was essential that the criteria were explicit and consistent. Each member of the team must also adopt the same methods of analysing the data. Above all the team should try to find some independent source of evidence.

Stiggins and Bridgeford (1985, p. 86, 87) suggested that there was a need to find ‘proof of the link between evaluation and instructional improvement’. They suggested that evaluation of individual teachers as it was carried out in parts of America was ‘seemingly
ineffectual in improving instruction.' They suggest, among other things, a greater use of student evaluation and more involvement of the teacher in the process.

Wilkins, (1989, p.10) describing the arrangements for inspection in Nottinghamshire, makes the following statement:

However, using only the traditional full-scale inspection ...has for long been felt to be insufficient and too inflexible. Two major developmental paths have therefore been followed. One of these involved variations of the inspection's shape - length, focus, intensity, use of inspectors and so forth. The other has been to increase the involvement of the school, not just in debate and the making of suggestions but in the actual process itself.

Schemes of this sort have a flexibility and can be adapted to the situation on the ground in a way which will be difficult with the OFSTED scheme.

Peterson (1987) described teacher evaluation in a school district in Utah where various forms of evaluation were compared and contrasted. There were 8 lines of evidence - student report, parent survey, student achievement, teacher tests, peer review, administrator report, documentation of professionalism and 'other'. They found that teacher test scores were negatively, though not significantly, associated with student, parent and administrator ratings. Administrator reports, by which he meant reports by the principal, tended to be lenient and showed low correlations with other measures. In general the lines of evidence tended to be independent of one another. This study suggests that the inclusion of parent surveys in the new pattern of inspection may well furnish interesting additional evidence.

Wilcox (1992, p.7,8) differentiated among evaluation, monitoring and inspection, pointing out that inspection tended to be omitted from writing on evaluation. He made the following points about evaluation:

- Evaluation is based on evidence which is systematically collected;
- The meaning of evidence is seldom unambiguous and therefore needs to be interpreted;
- Judgements of value are made about the entity being evaluated and its effects;
- Evaluation is action oriented, intended to lead to better practices and policies.

He went on to state that:

Monitoring involves the collection of information, on a regular basis, in order to check on the progress of an activity or the state of a system.

He suggested that inspections developed as data were collected and interpreted rather than following a pre-determined design. They tended to use qualitative approaches close to those of everyday life - observing, talking - more often than specialised quantitative methods. They involved a close relationship with respondents and observers were able to use tacit knowledge. Findings were expressed in terms of the particulars of the situation with some similarities to a case study approach.
Wilson (1988, p.25) listed the evidence available on teaching quality. This was in 4 categories:

1. Documentary evidence - materials prepared, test questions set, record system, letters to parents etc.
2. Observational evidence - first hand evidence from watching teacher at work or second hand by interviewing him (sic) or asking those who have been present.
3. Achievement evidence - work books completed, examination results, attitudes of pupils to subject, intellectual and practical skills.
4. Factual evidence - matters such as attendance, lateness, involvement in extra-curricular activities.

Nixon and Rudduck (1992, p.9, 15) also studied advisers’ work in inspection. They found that many of the advisers they interviewed had entered the service with quite different ideas in mind. Many had been successful in curriculum development and had contributed to in-service training and saw themselves in the advisory role. This problem was also evident in the four authorities in this study. Nixon and Rudduck noted that:

it was evident from our interviews that advisers/inspectors were experiencing considerable disorientation as they sought ways of utilising past talents and sustaining past commitments within the new culture.

They questioned whether the lists of criteria that new inspectors were spending time constructing were, to some extent, a diversion from the complicated task of understanding the nature of professional judgement and applying it in a whole school context.

They found advisers well aware of the need for team work in inspection. They also stressed the need for classroom observation:

The real cutting edge of local inspection, as perceived by the advisers/inspectors themselves, is the overriding emphasis it places on the quality of learning in particular classrooms and subjects and how this is reflected in the achievement and progress of individual pupils and in their level of engagement with their work.

However, they felt that very often what advisers saw was a collection of individual lessons. There was a need for greater emphasis on whole school issues.

According to Potter’s (1992) account of his training for the new form of inspection it would appear to place a greater emphasis than formerly on inspection for accountability as opposed to inspection for development. Inspections by the local authority teams in this study have been strongly slanted towards development. In future the full report has to be available to parents in school and in the local library and all parents will receive a summary.

The function of the inspection will be to report on:
- the quality of education provided by the school;
- the educational standards achieved;
- whether the financial resources of the school are managed efficiently;
- the spiritual, moral, social and cultural welfare of the pupils.
The quality of teaching and learning will be graded 1 - 5 for every lesson observed. There will be a pre-inspection meeting for parents and there may also be a questionnaire distributed to parents asking for their views on the school.

HMI will monitor inspections and will continue to train inspectors. They will also re-inspect in the case of complaint and where there is a lack of bids to undertake the inspection. Payment will be to the Registered Inspector in each case who will decide how much members of the team are to be paid.

There are many concerns about this system. Salter (1991) made the point that unless HMI continue to inspect they will no longer have the expertise to oversee inspection by others.

Deschamp and McGaw (1979, p.210) writing of the situation in Australia, noted that:

Centrally initiated evaluations ... can readily dominate the school's internal evaluation. The particular interests of an individual inspector, so quickly transmitted along the grapevine, take priority over identified school needs.

Pearce (1992 p 13) made the same point:

The real risk is not that inspectors may be in the pay and pocket of the school, but the other way round - that the school, desperate to satisfy and placate inspectors it does not know from Adam (whoever pays them) may cease to be true to itself.

In the same article Pearce also made a statement about the difficulties of inspection:

Inspection has 5 elements. It analyses data, deploys a range of observers, watches lessons, collects other observational evidence and evolves a collective view of all that it has gathered. Each of these is itself an expert business. On the data you have to know what questions to ask and indeed what secondary data may be needed for interpreting basic information. An adequate subject balance in a team of limited size is tricky and briefing about thinly-covered areas is critical. The selection of lessons to be observed by 10 inspectors in 5 days, for example pre-supposes some sophisticated time-table analysis. Knowing how to read the marks and signs of a school outside of lessons - the buildings, behaviour, body-language ... is a subtle, sensitive affair, especially in primary schools where display may mislead.

Leonard (1992) suggested that local teams of advisers might well be selective about those of the schools in their area they chose to tender for. They might well use their local knowledge to avoid schools known to pose problems, leaving these to outsiders.

A number of the statements above spoke of or implied monitoring with the local authority advisory service in an accountability role and this was the situation before the 1992 Education Act. Education is spending public money and LEAs were seen in the 1988 Act to have a duty to ensure that it was being well spent, a duty which was mainly to be discharged by the advisory services together with those officers who were concerned with monitoring finance.

Kogan (1986) suggested that there were three models of accountability. There was
public or state control, with authority resting with elected representatives, appointed officials, 
headteachers and others who manage schools; professional control by teachers and profes-
sional administrators with associated self-reporting evaluation and consumerist control with 
either participatory democracy in the public sector or market mechanism. We have moved 
largely into the last model but with increased authority with the Secretary of State. This has 
changed the kind of process of evaluation from a largely participatory one to an external one. 

Holt (1981, p.16) was very critical of the ability of local authority advisers to inspect 
schools. He commented that it was ‘clearly impossible for LEA advisers to close their minds 
to the various impressions they have collected about a school, or a particular subject 
department in the course of their regular professional transactions with the school’ . He felt 
that the ambiguity that the demand for both advice and inspection created was disturbing to 
teachers who could not be sure which hat the adviser was wearing when he or she visited the 
school, a view also stated by some teachers in this study. This leaves out of account the value 
of inspection where the school is known and the progress it has made can be assessed. HMI 
inspections have always been snapshots at a particular point in time which could not take 
account of the progress a school had made.

Stillman and Grant (1989) found that the right to inspect was part of the responsibility 
of 94% of advisers. Those titled inspector spent 12.5% of their time inspecting and those titled 
adviser 10.2%.

The Audit Commission (1989, pp. 1) reported on its own study of advisory services and 
made the following point about inspection:

LEAs need assurance, independent of institutional management, that education of a satisfactory quality 
is being provided. That assurance can only come as a result of professional monitoring, including direct 
observation (inspection). Measures to secure improvement also require a detached professional input 
(advice).

The Commission also made the point that part of the necessary information could be gathered 
only by professional observation and required the application of educational judgement 
before it could be used to assist in the formulation of recommendations for action. They also 
stressed that monitoring needed to produce results which could influence the activity being 
monitored.

Learmonth (1989, p.20) commenting on the Audit Commission Report suggested that:

The integrated team rather than separate inspection and advisory groups is surely good sense: LEA 
evaluation, divorced from the continuing involvement implied in its responsibility for an institution’s 
continuing development, runs too great a risk of becoming mechanical and superficial.

Inspection of various kinds was therefore a major role for advisers from 1988 until 
1992, a role which took a greater part of the time available than in the past when support for
schools was seen as more important. Bolam (1978) found that only 51% of advisory teams undertook general inspection compared with 93% who spent time on in-service work. This increased during the 1980s so that Stillman and Grant (1989) found that 79.5% of advisers were involved in formal inspection. Carter and Arnold (1990, p.1) describing discussions with a group of chief advisers state:

With whatever degree of variation from one LEA to another, it will increasingly become the role of the adviser to monitor performance and the delivery of the National Curriculum. The emphasis will be on 'quality promotion' as distinct from 'advisory support for schools.'

Rhodes (1981, p.1) spoke of two kinds of inspection, *enforcement inspection* which was inspection to ensure compliance with statutory requirements and *efficiency inspection* which was inspection to secure, maintain or improve standards of performance. While there was an element of enforcement inspection in the work of advisers post 1988, enforcement inspection, strictly speaking, carries the right to impose sanctions and this was not part of the role of advisers or HMI. Both are efficiency inspectorates. They were 'dependent on any action they might take as a result of inspection on the general administrative powers which their employing department was able to bring to bear.' Rhodes defined inspection as 'looking carefully into, viewing closely and critically, examining something with a view to finding out its character and condition.'

Rhodes commented that there was a general assumption that inspection was an effective means of enforcing legislative requirements. He believed that this has inhibited fundamental appraisal of its principles and methods.

Nebesnuick (1989, pp.1, 2) noted definitions by Buckinghamshire and Cheshire of various terms used in the process of inspection.

**Monitoring (Buckinghamshire definition)**
The regular checking, against a set of criteria and performance indicators of aspects of the process of education. Monitoring is carried out through observation and analysis of each establishment’s own documentation and processes. The County’s criteria will form the framework within which the performance indicators will be developed by schools in partnership with the County.

**Evaluation (Cheshire definition)**
A description of any activity by the institution or the LEA where the quality of provision is the subject of systematic study. Its function is to secure or improve the functioning of an institution in order to produce a better quality of educational experience.

**Review (Cheshire definition)**
Indicates a retrospective activity and implies collection and examination of evidence. It provides the basis for informed judgement.

**Assessment (Cheshire definition)**
Implies the use of measurement and/or a grading based on known criteria.
Bolam et al (1978, pp.81,82) recorded various views about inspection:

General inspections are of value to the advisers because they allow a deeper examination of a school or a subject than is otherwise possible. The school inspected reacts to the situation with a general tightening up and at least some of the staff re-thinking their role.

Inspections can destroy the relationships which one has built up over a prolonged period.

They concluded that very few advisers wanted more inspection. This view was supported by the reasons which advisers gave for joining the service. These were largely to do with a desire to improve the system through the advisory role.

Birnbaum (1989, p.157) noted that there were 7 main criteria to be applied to arrangements for inspection:

- They must be credible;
- The outcomes must be valuable;
- They must be effective;
- The evidence collected must be reliable;
- The judgements made must be valid;
- The process should be verifiable;
- The lessons from the process should be transferable.

It remains to be seen whether the new arrangements for inspection will meet these criteria.

Nebesnuick (1991, p.77) surveyed the way in which a number of authorities were evaluating the work of schools following the Education Reform Act. His results were as follows:

- Full inspection 76% of authorities
- Departmental inspections/surveys 94%
- Focussed day visits 85%
- Thematic cross-establishment surveys 95%
- Course review surveys 43%
- Supporting institutional development plans 97%
- Supporting school self-evaluation 90%
- Attached adviser support 95%
- Other 15%

This list does not include negotiated inspections where the school and the advisory team agree together the aspects of the school which will be looked at. However, Nebesnuick lists this as one of the main priorities in inspection. It was a feature of all four of the authorities in this study.

A very important part of the function of advisers is that of observing in classrooms. This is the case whether the adviser concerned comes as an inspector with a brief to evaluate what is seen and report on it or as a help and support to the teacher. Classroom observation is also
important for advisory teachers who are clearly there to support the teacher.

Weade and Evertson (1991, p.38) gave a critical account of what can be learned by observing teaching. They pointed out that observation must have a focal point which was more than the tacit observation which is part of everyday life. They suggested that having a focus does not necessarily 'imply a particular or pre-determined course of action' They omitted to mention that one danger of unfocused observation was that the observer's subconscious prejudices may govern what is seen. They noted the difference that different observers make to the situation - a point that most advisers know well and they stress that what was seen was no more than a sample of what happens in the classroom. An important point was that the focus was too often on the teacher and his or her performance rather than on the interaction between teacher and students. The article ended with a useful summary of different types of note-taking for observation and the advantages and disadvantages of each.

Sergiovanni (1984, p.357) also wrote of classroom observation in the context of the American practice of evaluating the work of teachers, contrasting the scientific approach which he described as theoretical with the phenomenological which he described as a practical approach:

A practical perspective in supervision and evaluation is also dynamic and expansive. In contrast to the theoretical perspective, this holistic view seeks to make sense of classroom events, to explain and understand what is going on. Its purpose is not to establish truth in a traditional scientific sense but to be helpful to persons involved and to encourage meaningful change... Further, a practical perspective is decision oriented. As a result of supervision something is intended to happen to teaching.

He is critical of the scientific approach on the grounds that it 'is only able to reveal truth within the limits of how its subject matter is conceived'

Like many other proponents of an ethnographic approach, he seems unaware that when one observes without any particular brief, one is governed by one's frame of reference and ideas about how things should be and is, often without being entirely aware of it, looking for particular things just as surely as those who come in with a check list.

Shaw and Ormston (1993, p.1) studied the reactions of teachers to inspection in 2 primary and 2 secondary schools. They found that 'nearly two thirds of teachers change their lessons to perform before inspectors in the classroom ... They switched to more "structured and inflexible" sessions than they had originally planned to run once they knew an inspector was coming into the classroom'. They also found that twice as many women expressed worries over inspection and 3 times more men than women felt that it was an annoyance. 'One-fifth of the respondents - all women - said they did not feel that the observed lesson gave a true reflection of their normal standard of teaching.'

Turner (1987, pp.77, 85) describes a study of self-evaluation by a school validated by
inspection by the local advisory team. He commented that one head of department said that he was ‘torn between being brutally honest and papering over the cracks’ in producing a report. This would seem to be one of the problems of any report that is to be made public. The inspection that followed, undertaken at a time when schools were not in the habit of being inspected, gave rise to some comments that underline the problems of inspection. Turner noted the following:

Some teachers described the inspection as a very artificial set-up and claimed that in general people were not giving normal lessons. For example, it was pointed out to me that some teachers were making lesson notes for the first time in years. However, the majority of teachers who were interviewed claimed they had not done anything different from what they would have done were they not being observed, but they had probably prepared lessons more carefully and thought things through more.

Abbott (1990) analysed 50 HMI reports on primary schools searching for the criteria by which HMI were making judgements. She found a number of these judgements were clearly discernible but questioned whether there should not be some examination of the validity of HMI inspection by other researchers. She pointed out that HMI reports lack the clarity of those written by professional researchers and noted that anthropologists found that it took a great deal longer than the time allocated to a full inspection to gain genuine understanding of a human community.

Blanchard et al. (1991, p.95) made a national survey of the work of advisory teachers. The article did not give any clear idea of what was asked of respondents but they concluded that there might be as many as 4500 advisory teachers working (an average of 40 per LEA). They noted that ‘most of our respondents state that it was the advisory teachers’ role to pursue the outcomes of inspections’. In the light of the findings of the survey described in chapter 5 this is disturbing. The number of advisory teachers for 55% of authorities is likely to fall from 1470 to 903. If they are to provide the main follow up to inspection schools are likely to do rather badly.

Dean (1978a, p.5) noted the problems which can arise because different people involved in the process of evaluation have different frames of reference. Those inspecting schools need to be aware of this and look from the teacher’s point of view as well as from their own. She also suggested that ‘many things in a school look different when you attempt to stand where an individual child stands and try to see through his (sic) eyes and those of his parents’

The situation in the 4 authorities
Authority A had a history of inspecting its schools but a good deal of thought and attention had been paid to the process in the last two years and the headteachers with whom it was discussed felt that there had been considerable improvement. The chief inspector in authority
A spoke of the difficulty of having sufficient expertise among a small team for inspecting secondary schools. They were having to deal with this by involving advisory teachers for some areas of curriculum. Schools were asked in each case whether they were happy to accept this. None had so far refused but headteachers commented that advisory teachers had no 'clout'. Inspectors saw them as reporting to the appropriate inspector on their findings and the inspector would then deal with reporting both verbally and in writing.

This authority was also attempting to recruit people to the service as inspectors who had senior management experience so that schools could not say that inspectors lacked a broad overview. This was becoming increasingly difficult because of salary differentials and the changes coming about.

At the time of the study authority A planned a programme of 6 primary inspections per year, giving a 5 year cycle, together with a departmental inspection in each of their 9 secondary schools each term with the departments to be inspected chosen by the headteachers in each case. This was generally appreciated by secondary schools who felt that departmental inspections allowed them to concentrate some attention on the department inspected rather than coping with the findings of a full inspection.

They also did thematic inspections and were looking at the results of the Language in the National Curriculum (LINC) project at the time of the discussion. They aimed to do a follow up after 4 or 5 terms for each inspection undertaken, looking at how the school had dealt with the recommendations of the original inspection. The good average score per item from the headteachers of this authority for follow up (2.64) and comments from headteachers and teachers suggested that they were able to carry out follow up inspections as planned. Authority A included a governor in its inspection team.

Authority B had started inspecting schools some 2 years ago and had looked at about 10 schools a year in which it conducted what was known as School Review and Development (SRD) a practice where school and advisory service worked together over the course of a year. They were about to move on to some more formal inspections. In addition they reviewed all their secondary schools every other year, collecting together all the information they had on each one and discussing it as a team. This review was then discussed with the headteacher. There had not previously been reports from this practice but the team was about to produce reports to governors from the biennial review.

Authority C had no history of inspections and had a past advisory service which was used at the request of schools. They set up three kinds of inspection. Link review was a 2 day review of a school by the general adviser and one other. The team expected to do 150 of these in a year. This was complemented by team reviews of 4 or 5 days which did not involve the general adviser. Team reviews involved a lay member who might be a governor, a staff member and 4 or 5 advisers. Nine schools had had a team review in the previous year. There were also theme reviews which looked at some aspect of the work across a number of schools.
Authority D had inspected schools for some time and about 2 years ago had separated advice and inspection. The principal inspector felt that the division had given them an opportunity to ‘home in on specific aspects of the job with more rigour and with greater concentration.’ They had also been able to develop a process which they called ‘commissioned audit’ which was an opportunity for schools to request an audit of some particular aspect of their work. The inspectorate felt that this had been very useful. Follow up to inspection was handed over to a link adviser.

They had inspected 21 primary schools, 6 middle schools and 4 secondary schools in the year which was ending. They had also done commissioned audits of aspects of 3 further and higher education institutions. They included a lay person and a teacher in their inspection teams.

Authority D had set up a headteachers’ group to look critically at inspections and with whom inspectors discussed the inspection process.

The involvement of lay people, governors and members of staff in the various inspections appeared to have been accepted quite happily by schools. One school expressed this view about governors spending time in classrooms:

I think we’ve had a number of governors over the last few years come along to observe. I think on each occasion they’ve come into the department it’s been one of, you know, interest and wanting to find out more because they’re not really sure of what we’re doing and what the subject involves and so I think it’s been a very useful exercise from that point of view.

Secondary school head of department

A headteacher expressed this view about including a member of staff:

We decided that I would nominate a member of staff to be part of the review team so that it wasn’t seen so much as something from outside and I did nominate a teacher who also happened to be a governor, a teacher governor, someone who would have a lot of credibility with the staff. He also happened to be a strength and I think that was worthwhile.

Secondary school headteacher

A senior teacher from the same school made this comment:

As far as I am aware the preparation was of the nature of a number of meetings of the actual team of which we had a teacher representative from the school ... which was of itself helpful because it was less sort of behind closed doors.

Secondary school teacher

Haigh (1992, p.28) described the experience of a grant maintained school which called on the advisory team of another local authority to inspect. This involved each department working with the inspector concerned to decide its own priorities for inspection. He concluded with the statement:
The fear is that the developmental approach with inspection, consultancy and training working together, may well prove difficult to sustain.

All four of the authorities in this study involved the schools to be inspected to some extent in discussion about the focus of the inspection and this was much appreciated. Headteachers said it gave them the opportunity to marry the inspection in with their own plans for development. In the authorities where inspection was a new activity there were some problems and difficulties as the inspections were set up and started but in general and with some exceptions the schools visited felt that the experience had been valuable and had contributed to their development.

**The questionnaires**

The question which was explored in relation to inspection was 'How do headteachers and teachers regard the inspections being conducted by local authority advisory teams?' This involved discussion with headteachers and teachers and a questionnaire survey.

*Headteachers' views of inspection*

Headteachers were asked 9 questions in relation to inspection. In each case they were asked to tick one of 4 columns which were headed 'good service', 'average service' and 'poor service' or 'service not used'. Ticks in the 'good service' column were counted as 3 points, those in the 'average service' column counted as 2 points and those in the 'poor service' column as one point. Those in the 'service not used' column were counted as 0 points. 'Service not used' was compensated for in making calculations (cf. pp.109,110)

It should be noted that there was considerable difference among the 4 in the percentage of items which were marked 'service not used' In authority A this was 17% of the total number of items marked for headteachers. In authority B it was 23%. Authority C had a total of 31% and authority D 28%. This pattern may be a reflection of the overall staffing ratio of advisers to schools in the four authorities, which is authority A - 5.1 schools per adviser, authority B - 8.4 schools per adviser, authority C - 9.7 schools per adviser and authority D - 9.4 schools per adviser.

The graphs on the next page show the the average scores for each item of the questionnaire for the four authorities. The average scores overall were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HEADTEACHERS’ VIEWS OF INSPECTION

Fig 8.1

D1 Evaluating the work of the school through inspection and other visits
D2 Monitoring the standards of learning and teaching
D5 Identifying shortcomings in the school
D6 Giving positive and negative feedback
D7 Giving heads opportunity for preliminary explanations pre-inspection
D8 Discussing work both before and after inspection
D9 Providing verbal reports
D10 Providing written reports
D11 Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection
Scores of 2.50 and above will be referred to as ‘good’. Those between 2.00 and 2.49 as ‘satisfactory’ and those below 1.99 as ‘poor’ (cf. p 81).

Page 165 provides a table of scores which folds out so that it can be consulted as this section of this chapter is read.

Authority A had all items above 2.50 and had the highest score for every item. Authority B had no good scores above 2.50 and no poor scores below 2.00. They had the lowest score for 5 items. Authority C had 4 good scores of 2.50 or above and one poor score below 2.00. They had the lowest score for two items, sharing this with authority B for item D6, ‘Giving positive and negative feedback’. Authority D had one good score above 2.50 and one poor score below 2.00 and the lowest score for one item. It is interesting to note that Authority D which has separated inspection and advice did not score as well as authority A where inspectors still perform both functions.

Authority A did comparatively well on all items. Particular strengths appear to be ‘Evaluating the work of the school through inspection and other visits’ (2.83) and ‘Giving headteachers opportunity for preliminary explanation pre-inspection’ (2.87) The least satisfactory appear to be ‘Identifying shortcomings’ (2.53) and ‘Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection’ (2.53) but both of these have scores above 2.50.

Authority B did best on ‘Discussing work both before and after inspection’ (2.37). Their least good score was for ‘Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection’ (2.07).

Authority C did best on ‘Providing verbal reports’ (2.65) and ‘Providing written reports’ (2.59). Their least good score was for ‘Identifying shortcomings’ (1.91).

Authority D’s best score was for ‘Identifying shortcomings’ (2.72). Their lowest score was for ‘Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection’ (1.67) where it had a much lower score than other authorities. This may be the effect of separating inspection and advice.

Teachers' views of inspection

Teachers were also asked to complete a questionnaire which had 8 rather than 9 questions about inspection. These were slightly different from those for headteachers in order to match them to classroom practice. They were scored in a similar way and allowance was made for items marked ‘service not used’. Graphs showing the average scores per person for each item are shown on the next page and scores are summarised on the fold out table on page 165.

In all 4 authorities the scores for teachers were below those for headteachers. The overall average scores for each authority were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TEACHERS' VIEWS OF INSPECTION

Fig 8.2

**AUTHORITY A**

**AUTHORITY B**

**AUTHORITY C**

**AUTHORITY D**

D1 Evaluating the work of the school through inspection
D2 Monitoring standards of learning and teaching
D3 Observing teachers at work in the classroom
D4 Monitoring classroom work
D5 Identifying shortcomings
D6 Giving positive and negative feedback
D7 Giving teachers opportunity for preliminary explanation pre-inspection
D8 Discussing work with teachers before and after inspection
Authority D had the only good score which was for inspection and there were 11 poor scores.

Authority A had the highest scores for 4 of the items and the lowest scores for none. Authority B had the lowest score for every item with 6 poor scores. Authority C had the highest scores for 3 items and one item with a score below 2.0. Authority D had the highest score for one item, shared the lowest score for one with authority B, had one other lowest score and had 4 scores below 2.00.

Authority A’s highest score was for ‘Giving positive and negative feedback’ (2.47) The lowest scores were for ‘Monitoring classroom work’ (2.19) and ‘Giving teachers opportunity for preliminary explanation pre-inspection’ (2.15).

Authority B had the lowest scores overall. The highest score was for ‘Giving positive and negative feedback’ (2.04). The lowest was for ‘Giving teachers opportunity for preliminary explanation pre-inspection’ (1.67).

Authority C’s highest score was for ‘Evaluating the work of the school through inspection and other visits’ (2.42). They also had the highest score for ‘Observing teachers at work’ (2.31) ‘Giving teachers opportunity for preliminary explanation pre-inspection’ (2.36) and ‘Discussing work with teachers before and after inspection’ (2.30) Their lowest score was for ‘Monitoring classroom work’ (1.92).

Authority D’s highest score was for ‘Evaluating the work of the school through inspection’ (2.59) which would seem to be something of a justification for the separation of inspection and advice but this was not supported by their scores on other items. There was a score of 2.29 for ‘Giving positive and negative feedback’ but all other scores were low. The lowest score was ‘Monitoring classroom work’ (1.77).

Two items which were common to headteachers and teachers had no scores below 2.00. These were ‘Evaluating the school through inspection and other visits’ and ‘Giving positive and negative feedback’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Authority A</th>
<th>Authority B</th>
<th>Authority C</th>
<th>Authority D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores in this table are the average scores per item and the average overall score. Bold type indicates the highest score for that item in the questionnaire. Italic indicates the lowest score for that item in the questionnaire. Underlined scores of 2.50 and above. Rectangle outline scores below 2.00.

D1 Evaluating the work of the school through inspection and other visits
D2 Monitoring the standards of learning and teaching
D3 Observing teachers at work in the classroom
D4 Monitoring classroom work
D5 Identifying shortcomings
D6 Giving positive and negative feedback
D7 Giving head/teachers/teachers opportunity for preliminary explanation pre-inspection
D8 Discussing work both before and after inspection
D9 Providing verbal reports
D10 Providing written reports
D11 Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection
Comments in questionnaires

There were only 4 comments in questionnaires which concerned inspection. These included some positive comments on the value of inspection.

I found the following service very beneficial and supportive. Our adviser recently completed a curriculum review of our curriculum area. This involved an initial planning meeting between herself and the coordinator of curriculum, a two day visit when every member of staff was seen in a classroom situation, a reporting back session to coordinator and heads of department and now running extra INSET to rectify planning shortfall within the department.

Secondary school teacher, authority B

The programme of extended review set up by the advisory service in our authority provides continuous feedback and positive steps for development within a critical by supportive framework.

Secondary school headteacher, authority C

There were comments about the credibility of inspectors whose background was secondary school inspecting in primary schools:

I believe formal inspection carried out in primary schools should be undertaken by primary inspectors not secondary inspectors

Primary teacher, authority A

There was an expression of concern about the lack of discussion following an inspection

The school had a one week inspection recently which was a negative experience as we had not direct feedback at the time the inspectors were in school. We would have welcomed direct dialogue at the time which we feel would have made a positive contribution to the school’s development.

Junior school teacher, authority A

Evidence from interviews

Interviews were held with the chief adviser in each authority and with groups of advisers and advisory teachers. There were also interviews with groups of primary and secondary headteachers and with heads and some staff in 12 schools which had been inspected. The schools visited included four secondary schools, three primary schools, one junior school, one infant school, one middle school and two lower schools. They were not a random sample, being chosen by the local chief adviser, but they included at least one school deliberately selected because inspection had been something of a disaster as well as schools where the reports were very good.

A number of headteachers spoke of staff feeling threatened by advisory visits. Headteachers were also aware of the extent to which different advisers and inspectors were able to dispel or enhance the feeling of threat.
Some of the teachers’ own comments bear out this view:

I think there’s always that nagging feeling at the back of your mind, that you’ve overlooked something or that there’s something that somebody else can see from outside that you can’t see yourself and I think that’s always the fear.

Lower school teacher, authority D

And obviously, although you know that nobody’s going to turn round and say, ’Well you aren’t worthy to be a teacher’ and sack you or anything but they’re going to sort of - maybe - you are on the line. I don’t care how confident you feel. You are on the line. People are going to make comments and you are very aware of that and I think it’s human nature to want to show yourself off in the best light, you know. You don’t want to let yourself down.

Secondary school teacher, authority D

Teachers and headteachers appreciated good preparation for inspection made in good time. All four authorities had meetings for staff and for governors well in advance of the inspection at which they attempted to show the human face of inspection. Teachers felt better about it when they knew what was going to happen and the criteria by which judgements were to be made. The meetings which were most successful in the eyes of teachers and headteachers were those where the inspector taking them created a good relationship with the teachers concerned and reassured them that the whole process was for their benefit, that it would be positive and directed to the development of the school rather than to finding out the things that they were doing wrong. The following comments show this:

A   The principal inspector came in and spoke to us as a staff and I think we certainly felt very at ease about that. It was useful, very informative.

B   He gave us guidelines of what they would be looking at.

A   Yes, it was very good from that point of view because we felt we knew what they would be focussing on and we felt very at ease about it really.

Lower school teachers, authority D

Even where this was done there were still concerns and anxiety in some schools.

HT   My concern as a head was initially when there was discussion with the staff was that staff should feel positive. And I think that just the word 'inspection' meant that staff were very much on the defensive. They were suspicious and therefore the onus was on the inspection team was to break down this barrier before the actual inspection took place.

Q   And did they?

HT   I think they made positive efforts to show the human face, but nevertheless there seemed to be - staff were suspicious that there was a hidden agenda no matter what verbal assurances there were from the team and staff did feel very much as though they were going to be under the microscope and they did feel that they wanted to know what it was all about - they were anxious about themselves. They were anxious about their classroom management when an inspector would be in place.

Primary school headteacher, authority A
In one case the attitude of the lead inspector created problems:

She had given us to understand that the staff were going to see the human face of inspection and to a certain extent it would be an exercise in reassurance and I don’t think the staff perception was that at all. I think very much they got the impression that here was an ‘inspector’ and that seemed to be the line being set, so although questions were being asked, I think, you know, that that particular session was nowhere near as profitable as it might have been.

Middle school headteacher, authority D

Pre-inspection meetings could take place too far in advance of the inspection itself. One primary school teacher in authority A commented that they had had too long to ‘get worked up about it.’

All the authorities asked for a good deal of information before the inspection and schools commented that it was helpful to have this clearly defined although one school complained that advisers were asking for material which they should have had on file.

There were differing views about whether it was helpful to know to which lessons inspectors would be coming. The majority of teachers found it reassuring to know when they would be visited. They were aware that it meant that they would do their best to put on a show for the lessons the inspector was to see but felt that the alternative was that they would be putting on a show for the whole time the inspectors were in the school and they felt this was much more of a strain. One head of department commented:

I’ve got two staff, ... who I (would) really rather they didn’t know, because I know if they’re told ... they (will) want to do something quite different to what they would normally do because they feel they ought to do something spectacular and it doesn’t matter how many times you say ‘This lesson’s continuous. Carry on as you would normally.’

Secondary school head of department, authority A

A headteacher made the following points:

We were given a timetable of where people would be going during the day so members of staff had some idea when somebody would be coming and who that person would be. And having people knowing that I think they probably thought ‘Well I know what I’ve got to do’ and I know what I would have done as well! People held fire with certain things they were going to do a little bit so that when somebody came they were doing the part that they wanted to be doing.

Primary school headteacher, authority B

In one of the smaller schools visited, visits on the first day were programmed but thereafter inspectors went to lessons as they wished. The staff found this very satisfactory because the inspectors concerned managed to make really good relationships with them on the first day and they were able to feel confident enough on the subsequent days not to worry about being visited.

Teachers also felt that it was important for inspectors to talk with them before the lesson about what they were going to do.
I think it (inspection) is enhanced for everybody concerned if they're given some opportunity to share with the inspector the context in which they're working and what they think the children are at and what it is they are trying to do. 

Secondary school headteacher, authority A

However, primary teachers, in particular, found inspectors who tried to talk to them during the lesson something of a problem because they felt they needed to give all their attention to the children.

I found that actually if I was asked questions within the classroom context, I was not satisfactorily able to give answers, because I had 34 children with a practical activity lesson. What I did find was the questions were pursued and went into break time so we were able then to talk afterwards and really answering an involved question at the time when you have children that need your attention is difficult. 

Primary school teacher, authority B

Teachers felt that the attitude of the inspector in the classroom was important. They found it intimidating if the inspector spent all the time at the back with a clipboard making notes which were never shown to the teacher.

HT If the body language conveys 'I'm here to inspect' staff will react in a particular way.

Q What body language conveys, 'I'm here to inspect'?

HT Clipboard. Sitting at the back, making, visibly making notes and the fact that there was very little communication. For example an inspector might go into the room. There might be a verbal exchange, but it was very much 'I'm here to inspect' and just sit back and just carry on and then after the session there might have been a word, but nothing in the way of sign language, the warmth, the smile, perhaps a little bit of a joke or something about a particular child. These things would have helped to break it down. 

Primary school headteacher, authority A

I think it's very important that the person who comes into your classroom you feel comfortable with and I did feel comfortable in the event and I liked very much that after the sessions were over we had time to talk about and evaluate what had gone on. 

Middle school teacher, authority D

However good the relationship the inspector achieved, his or her presence disturbed children as well as teacher and no inspector sees the normal practice of the classroom.

Blease (1983, pp.215, 216) looked at the problems of classroom observation in terms of the effect this had on teachers and pupils. He was speaking as a researcher spending a long time in a classroom, rather than the much shorter visits likely to be made by advisers. However, his findings about the effect his presence had on teachers and children were likely to be even more true for advisers than for researchers because the children do not have time during the shorter visits of advisers to become accustomed to someone sitting at the back of the classroom. He reminded us that what an observer sees in the classroom may not be a good
sample of what normally happens. He noted that even teachers who appear to act naturally were affected by an observer and he quoted teachers’ comments such as the following:

I was in some respects perhaps more patient, more tolerant almost, while under observation. And to a certain extent I found it a little bit restrictive really. Perhaps I oughtn’t to have been quite so kind to some.

Take this lad over there, for instance, I think I would probably have treated him a lot more sharply than I did. I think also I would have been a lot less tolerant. I think I also went round a bit more than I might have done.

Blease pointed out that the children as well as teachers were affected by the presence of an observer, although he did not make it clear how evidence of this was collected. He stated that:

Many children had noted that they found it difficult to forget that I was sitting at the back of the room, and although they acknowledged that the effect diminished over time, they never felt free of it. Some children, it was claimed, ‘played to the gallery’ more than others which was plainly evident from the observer’s point of view also.

A further point which would have been of interest was the age group of the children which was not given. It would have been interesting to know whether the effect of an observer on the children differed at all with the age group.

One teacher in the present study described her experience like this:

One thing was the actual way that some advisers approached the actual time in the classroom - almost going back to old college days, sitting at the back taking notes. Other adviser colleagues actually joined in the activities, spoke to the children, wandered about the classroom, much freer atmosphere. I must admit I was aware that someone was sitting at the back taking notes and the children were aware that someone was sitting at the back, so there were different styles there, but I do appreciate the informal style, getting involved, because you’re still observing, you can still put your finger on what’s going on. Also involving the children in the situation I think. It gives a much better perspective.

Primary school teacher, authority B

Another commented:

It’s not just the staff that are affected because the children are also looking. I mean they desperately want to know what’s going on ... and they’re sort of looking round.

Secondary school teacher, authority D

Teachers felt very strongly about the importance of feedback. Both headteachers and teachers felt that feedback about the lesson seen should take place fully and as soon after the lesson as possible so that the teacher gained the maximum benefit. Some schools employed a supply teacher to make this possible. Teachers found it very disturbing when an inspector simply left the lesson without saying anything.
I think if you’re going to observe something in an area you’re not familiar, I mean a school you’re not familiar with, you have to be careful that what you observe - what is the rationale behind what you observe. So if you just make assumptions on the basis of... two days is nothing for a local inspection, is it?, so you’ve really got to do a tremendous amount in that time and there - I think that the observation needs to go along with what you had - which was a discussion - ‘I noticed this,’ ‘Why did you do that?’ or ‘Why was that one on her own?’ ‘I noticed she said nothing, was there a reason for that?’ or something. I think there needs to be some kind of dialogue between them on specifics if you’re really going to get the feel of the place.

*Secondary school teacher, authority A*

No comment means, ‘Good heavens, it must have been awful.’

*Secondary school teacher, authority A*

Even if it’s only thank you and a smile and whatever so they feel the world hasn’t fallen apart and really it wasn’t that bad.

*Secondary school head of department, authority A*

Staff do feel quite strongly - very strongly in fact, that they would like the opportunity to discuss. If that isn’t there all the other things lose their value. They do feel that if they’ve been observed, then they expect and feel they have an entitlement to discuss the content.

*Secondary school headteacher, authority A*

We had a very relaxed inspection, from the point of view the inspector who came in saw us informally as well and had coffee with us and there was an opportunity then for people to continue discussion and general points being asked which was quite nice and gave people the opportunity to say, you know, ‘Well this is our thinking’ and I think that was as important in some cases as the observation, the fact that people had a chance to actually respond and give their own impression.

*Secondary school head of department, authority A*

When this didn’t happen teachers felt that they had been sold short:

I think we felt a lack of communication. Once they arrived they didn’t communicate with us at all so we had no feedback, so we had no idea what they were thinking, whether they were happy at the time or not and quite often they took a lot of notes and we had no idea what they were writing or why. I mean, obviously we didn’t expect to see, but we all felt that if we had had at times some kind of reassurance or feedback then it would have been more positive for us.

*Junior school teacher, authority A*

There was concern also about the amount of time inspectors spent with individual teachers. Teachers wanted them to spend enough time to get an adequate picture of the work of the classroom but there was a strain on the teacher if the inspector spent too long in one classroom.

I personally had someone with me for a whole afternoon. I felt in a way that an afternoon was too long. I felt that it was a pressure to have somebody with you all the afternoon, even though the person with me seemed to enjoy it and everything went off fine and we all enjoyed ourselves and had a nice afternoon. I felt that an afternoon was more than enough from my point of view.

*Primary school teacher, authority B*

It was also a strain if the teachers were unable to get away from the inspectors. This is a problem in the small primary school where there is only the staff room for both groups. As one teacher put it:
I felt we didn’t have a chance to get away, because they were in the staffroom with us at break time and they were with us at lunch as well.

*Primary school teacher, authority B*

Teachers also liked to feel that pupils’ work has been looked at thoroughly and spoke approvingly of the HMI practice of asking for samples of work. One teacher spoke very critically of an adviser who had not studied the pupils’ work thoroughly and then made criticisms which she felt were inaccurate and could have been corrected by looking at what the pupils had done. Another teacher made the point that it was useful when advisers asked for children’s work in advance, particularly in subjects where work may have been taken home.

If you’re judging purely on what you see of the (pupil) during the lesson, it only gives part of the picture. It’s more use to see a collection of work over a long period of time.

*Secondary school head of department, authority A*

Discussion about wider issues was also welcomed particularly by headteachers who were keen to discuss some of the problems of organising work in the National Curriculum.

We (headteacher and general adviser) actually spent about one and a half hours hidden away so that people couldn’t find us, literally talking our way through all sorts of things from formative assessment, different ways of doing it the way we would do if we had a class full time, something we haven’t had time to do. We had time to ourselves literally just to talk about day-to-day running of a classroom, organisation, planning, all those things which I don’t think I’ve had time to talk with an adviser about for about 8 years ... It was probably one of the most worthwhile sessions that I’ve had for a long time.

*Primary school headteacher, authority B*

There were several concerns about credibility. These were more likely to occur with local authority advisers since their background was often known to the heads and teachers in a way which would be unusual for HMI. Advisers with a secondary background who came to inspect primary classes without having done enough homework on primary education came in for a lot of criticism and is something which will be less likely under the new system. However, some headteachers welcomed the fresh eye of someone coming from outside the primary sector but much depended on whether the person concerned had learned anything about primary schools before coming and on the relationship which he or she was able to form.

I think someone coming in who’s not had the experience, as I say, very little experience of junior schools and being so unopen to what we were saying.

*Junior school teacher, authority A*
Advisers themselves also felt concern about this. One commented:

I certainly don’t feel as confident dealing with primary issues as I do with secondary issues. I mean we can’t all be expected to be equally well informed and practised in terms of primary practice and secondary practice and therefore I feel there is some justification for some people within the overall team who are primary experts.

Inspector, authority A

There was also concern about the fact that many advisers were already in post when the National Curriculum came in and had not therefore had experience of teaching it in the classroom.

I’ve got one very good head of department who really did wonder whether what the inspector and the advisory teacher together were trying to comment on was realistic and this is when teachers are trying to work the National Curriculum in a manageable way, working in an area in which they know very little and yet the inspectors are asking questions and the advisory teachers are asking a question which on the face of it seems a whale of a question. And then when the head of department says, ‘Well I haven’t got an answer, what’s your answer?’ the inspector or adviser hasn’t got an answer either and that answer hasn’t gone down terribly well with the head of department.

Secondary school headteacher, authority A

The other thing I think is important is the National Curriculum and how far advisers can remain credible with never having any experience of the National Curriculum, in a very practical way, but just the sort of bird’s eye observing.

Primary school headteacher, authority C

Some primary teachers in particular felt that specialist advisers did not always appreciate the pressures they were under with every subject to teach.

They tend to get very involved in their subject and it’s all very well but when you have to teach everything else as well it’s hard to address everything they would like to see going on.

Primary school teacher, authority A

There was also concern about advisers who were not sufficiently open minded. Some schools felt that the people who had inspected them were interested only in seeing their own ideas put into practice. In the words of one teacher:

I think their preconceived philosophy shone through all the time in that they had very strong opinions and there was an intolerance coming through all the time.

Junior school teacher, authority A

Another criticism was that the views of individual teachers were sometimes taken as the views of the whole staff particularly in the secondary school.

The way in which criticisms were made was also important. Where the advisers showed
genuine appreciation of the school’s good points, criticisms became much more acceptable. One school described feedback in these terms:

The positive suggestions were phrased in such a way that it’s very difficult to describe but it was done with great skill so that you felt that you were three-quarters of the way there and by the way, what about doing this and when you thought about it afterwards you realised that ‘by the way how about doing this’ were actually the key things which were coming over.

Secondary school head of department, authority A

One teacher commented with approval of the way in which the adviser in her classroom had always made the assumption that where something could have been better there was a reason for it being as it was. She said she felt he had respected her professionalism.

The way in which an adviser approached teachers was of considerable importance whether in the context of an inspection or more generally. Teachers had a good deal to say about this and particularly about the way in which inspectors managed feedback from inspection.

They were very appreciative of the things that they saw that were good and therefore that helps and the fact that they were appreciative and full of praise for the things they liked made us able to withstand the odd things they found fault with and that was balanced.

Middle school teacher, authority D

They were highly critical when this was badly done:

Because there was no discussion we had no right of reply. We weren’t given a chance to explain why maybe we were doing things.

Junior school teacher, authority A

Teachers and headteachers welcomed discussion about the findings. In most of the schools there was an element of negotiation of the report. Headteachers were told that while opinions would remain, matters of fact could be corrected and this appeared to happen in most of the schools and as a result most were reasonably happy with the final report.

What I’ve been impressed particularly with with one or two inspectors is their willingness to - if they’ve made a statement that seems perhaps rather blunt or I’d say, ‘Look you’ve only come in for a week but actually this is more how it is’ or if we’ve wanted to change the emphasis slightly they’ve always been prepared to say, ‘Well yes, that is a point’ and they’ve altered it.

Secondary school headteacher, authority A

I found that when you do the draft report having been at the verbal comment, then they send the draft for inaccuracies. I’ve found that they’ve bent over in the main, certainly in the last two out of three and have been incredibly positive in terms of saying, ‘Yes, thank you, I will alter or highlight that.’

Secondary school headteacher, authority A
Some reports took a very long time to come and while schools appreciated the importance of getting the report properly checked, they were concerned about this because they wanted to get on and work on the findings. This made the verbal feedback doubly important. One teacher commented about the slowness of the LEA in getting the report out:

We do tend to operate on a much faster level in school. I think there’s a difference in culture there, I mean the wheels are spinning much faster.

*Secondary school teacher, authority C*

Schools felt that follow up was very important and primary schools in particular welcomed follow up with advisers and advisory teachers.

Follow up always seems to have been done fairly sensitively and sensibly in terms of the refer back to the recommendations that they’ve done and they remind the department and they come in and discuss what they will looking at. I feel that those have been - they’re only lasting a day or two, not in the same depth as the inspection. But I think the fact that they happen and then again there’s feedback to the department which is very important and I think the follow up is very good because it does make the department realise that, you know, you can’t just wave the report away because there is going to be follow up.

*Secondary school headteacher, authority A*

The school also needs to follow up the inspection if it is to be of use to them:

We used it (the inspection report) as a very valuable tool for the school development plan and in the first - in the subsequent development plan ... several of the issues and recommendations of the report were reflected ... and we used it again the following year. So we’ve been able to use it as a very valuable tool for the school development and from that point of view it’s been very positive.

*Primary school headteacher, authority A*

In most cases there was also a formal follow up review in which the school was visited to discuss and find out how far they had come with the recommendations made as part of the inspection. This was generally appreciated.

Authority D had a system in which a link adviser was appointed to help the school to follow up the inspection and the district inspector for the school had the task of monitoring what happened. The following extracts describe some of the problems which can occur when inspection and advice are separated in this way:

I was under the impression that district inspector and link adviser would come together and they’d help you follow through. I had 2 separate visits. The link adviser came first but didn’t know the stuff of the school, misinterpreted the recommendations, went away with the wrong priorities. The district inspector got the right priorities and there was a bit of a problem persuading the link adviser who was right.

*Primary school headteacher, authority D*

Our district inspector came in and said ‘Right, now I’m supposed to monitor what has happened with your recommendations, but I’m not going to help you with it. I’ve got to ask somebody else who’s going to be, if you like, the adviser who will actually advise you all about it.’ Bureaucracy gone mad.

*Middle school headteacher, authority D*
There are also some advantages:

So in terms of working out, it’s allowed us to focus on particular processes and I think we do them much better than in the past. We’ve been able to develop critical pathways in inspection. Bit by bit we’ve been able to address issues as they’ve come on stream in a more systematic way.

Principal inspector, authority D

Overall the impression received from the schools was that inspection by local authority teams was successful in many cases in creating development in the school. It is to be hoped that inspection by privatised teams will be equally successful.

There was a feeling among the staff in some of the schools that the experience they had had of inspection by their local team was a good preparation for future inspections:

Now it’s all over there are all kinds of positive feelings about it, which I don’t think were in place ... because it was quite an anxiety producing time but the fact that it’s favourable has made us all feel good about what we’re doing and it means that when we have the lesser reviews, we are going to be able to say ‘This is easy’. It won’t be easy, I know, but we will feel less threatened by it. Any sort of input from whatever sort of inspection takes place in the future we’re going to be able to feel a bit more confident about it.

Primary school headteacher, authority C

One headteacher whose school had been amalgamated with another some four years previously made the point that it was important that those inspecting the school knew its context. He felt it was a matter for concern that the privatised inspection scheme which was to be implemented was likely to result in snapshots of schools which did not take into account where they had come from.

Summary

Findings in relation to the question asked

1. Headteachers would seem to have a fair amount of regard for the inspections run by the local advisory team. Teachers less so. Scores for all 4 authorities from teachers are lower than those for headteachers. This may be a reflection of the fact that teachers generally appear to find the process more threatening than headteachers.

2. Headteachers and teachers felt that inspection was a more valuable process when they were involved in discussing its focus and were able to link it with their own plans for the school. All 4 authorities aimed to do this.
Authority A had the best overall scores for all items for inspection from headteachers with an average score of 2.63 and all good scores. This could reflect the fact that inspection has been developing over a longer period in this authority or it may be that they have a better staffing ratio of inspectors to schools or they may simply have been better organised and more competent. It is of interest that this authority had a very small team and had difficulty in covering the whole curriculum. There may also be an element of its members being better known to schools and therefore more appreciated because of the small size of the authority.

Authorities B and D were given satisfactory scores throughout by headteachers with average of 2.22 and 2.26 respectively with the exception of a poor score of 1.67 for following up inspection in authority D. These scores suggested steady work. The low score for follow up may be the result of separating advice and inspection without organising the link up sufficiently. Authority C had an average score of 2.39, with 4 good scores and one poor score.

Authority A also did best with teachers with an overall score of 2.34. Authorities B and D had rather lower scores from teachers with an average of 1.90 and 2.07 respectively but D had the only good score given by teachers for ‘Evaluating the work of the school through inspection’ (2.59). However, they had poor scores for 4 other items. Authority C had a better average than B or D (2.24) and satisfactory scores except for ‘Monitoring classroom work’ which was poor.

Other findings

1 Three of the 4 authorities involved lay people in their inspections. This did not appear to cause much concern to schools. Authority D involved a member of staff also and this was appreciated.

2 Teachers generally felt threatened by inspection. It became less threatening if they were given information about what was going to happen and if they knew the criteria by which judgements were being made. All 4 authorities spent time and care preparing schools for inspection and this was appreciated by headteachers and teachers but it could go wrong if the attitude of the inspector was not satisfactory.
3 Most teachers found it helpful to know when an adviser or inspector would be coming into their classroom. They appreciated the opportunity to discuss what they would be doing with the adviser before the lesson. The attitude of the inspector in the classroom was important. Inspectors who sat at the back with a clipboard tended to be intimidating. This affected children as well as teachers. They appreciated it when pupils’ work was thoroughly examined. They felt very strongly about the need for feedback after the lesson and for some comment as the inspector left the classroom. Teachers and particularly headteachers welcomed discussion of wider issues. There was a strain in having inspectors in the school and this was enhanced if the inspector spent too long in one classroom.

4 Teachers were concerned about credibility from the point of view of specialist secondary advisers looking at primary schools and also because few advisers had had experience of working with the National Curriculum. Some specialist advisers appeared to teachers not to appreciate the breadth of the primary school teachers’ task.

5 The way in which reports were delivered was important. Teachers and headteachers appreciated it when criticisms were made in the context of appreciation of the school’s good points. Discussion about findings was welcomed and there was appreciation of the opportunity to negotiate points in the written report. The length of time some reports took to be delivered was a matter for concern because schools were often keen to start implementing the recommendations and this was easier to do once the report was available.

6 Headteachers and teachers felt that follow up was very important if the inspection was to be of value both from the authority and within the school. This included both advice and support and a programme of re-visiting after a period to check on what had happened.

7 The only evidence to suggest that separating inspection and advice improved inspection was that authority D was the sole authority to gain a good score from teachers for the actual process of inspection but there were 4 poor scores from teachers for other aspects of the inspection process. There was evidence that follow up in particular was considerably less satisfactory in Authority D than elsewhere.
9 THE KEY AREAS - ADVICE AND SUPPORT

Introduction

This second key area is under a certain amount of threat at the present time in many local education authorities because the money for advisory services is being delegated to schools who may or may not buy in the advice they need. (cf the national survey in chapter 5). There is particular concern for very small schools who probably have a greater need of advice than larger schools but are unlikely to be able to afford it on the scale that it has been available previously. The four authorities in this study were all thinking in terms of packages of services which schools might or might not buy.

Relevant literature

The Audit Commission (1989, p.118) listed three different groups of people as potential recipients of advice from the advisory service - the members and officers of the LEA, governors, heads and principals and individual members of school and college staffs. They made the point that outside advice is valuable to institutions because it brought a wider view.

Many respondents to the Audit Commission stressed the importance of their contact with schools:

Contact with schools is, for many advisers, the raison d'etre of their work but the value of that work depends, in part, on the network of other contacts which the adviser maintains.

Garnett (1977, p.33) described the views of headteachers about advisers. The headteachers felt that the adviser ‘should be a person with whom they could discuss administrative problems and curriculum development freely, looking to him (sic) for new ideas and stimulus.’

Dean (1979) looked at the problem created by the fact that advisers normally have an involvement in the promotion of teachers and the effect of this on their role as advisers. This could make teachers feel somewhat threatened and perhaps less ready to reject advice which seemed inappropriate. She suggested that the alternatives would tend to be worse since advice given by those who did not know the schools would be less effective. She stressed the importance of someone knowing each school well.

Wilcock (1977, p.16) writing as a headteacher who valued the support of advisers, regretted that there were too few opportunities to discuss the work of the school in general terms with advisers:
I feel a definite need to discuss in detail our own individual situation with someone whose opinions and views I respect, who moves in the wider world of education and is conversant with our own situation.

Some advisers in the study by Bolam et al (1978, p.72) saw the appointment of staff as an important way of bringing about change. Others were more cynical about a procedure undertaken mainly by laymen and women:

Having seen hundreds of appointments by committees of councillors and followed the careers of the successful candidates, I would regard appointments as a gamble. Sometimes drawing lots would be as useful.

Stanton (1979) gave an interesting account of the improvement of a lecturer’s technique as a result of using a consultant and feedback from students. This has relevance for advisers who are often in the position of trying to help teachers improve their performance. The particular point which was of interest was the use of student feedback, a technique rarely used by advisers, but one which could of considerable value where schools were prepared to use it, particularly where older children were concerned. In this study the consultant noted the criticisms which students were making and set up a meeting with the lecturer and group of the students who were very supportive in trying to suggest ways in which the lecturer could be more effective. As a result he changed his method of working completely to one in which there was much more experiential work and discussion and more involvement of students. The following year group of students rated his performance very highly.

Dean (1984, pp.9,10) listed some of the expectations which schools were likely to have of advisers. The following are extracted from a long list:

To be successful an advisory team must at least in part, fulfil the expectations of the schools. Schools expect advisers:

a) To be friendly and personal in their approach
b) To take a personal interest in the school, knowing at least the key members of the staff, their aspirations, strengths and weaknesses and the problems of the school in general terms
c) To give help and support to teachers who have professional difficulties
d) To reflect performance for the head and teachers
e) To provide headteachers and teachers with information about what is happening elsewhere
f) To provide expertise in certain curriculum areas over and above that in the school itself
g) To act as a catalyst within the school, helping the staff to achieve change
h) To be a focal point for solving problems and a sounding board for ideas
i) To help the head to evaluate what is happening within the school, to plan ahead and deploy resources
j) To foster continuity between various stages of education and liaison between the appropriate teachers
k) To ensure that appropriate in-service education is provided and sometimes to play a key role in programme organised

The National Steering Group on Teacher Appraisal (1989) suggested that headteachers should be appraised by two appraisers and that these should be a fellow headteacher and an officer of the LEA. Baker (1993) reviewed how this was working out in different authorities
and wrote of the adviser’s role as appraiser of headteachers. This appeared to be generally appreciated as bringing a rigour to the exercise and contributing experience of appraisals of other headteachers. In some authorities the adviser appraiser was the person with responsibility as link adviser to the school. In other cases an individual or small group had this as a major responsibility. In most authorities the appraiser was chosen by the chief education officer - presumably by delegation to the chief adviser or other person responsible for the scheme, but some authorities allowed headteachers to choose their own appraiser. Others could exercise a negative preference.

Biott (1991) described the work of advisory teachers and divided their work into 3 broad forms of support - for pupils, teacher/pupil support and support for curriculum and materials development. The teacher/pupil support consisted of general class support which involved team teaching, consultative support which was concerned with dealing with problems, analytical support where the advisory teacher was concerned with trying to detect what might be going wrong, observational support in which specific points in organisation, lesson preparation or learning strategy were observed, substitutional support where the advisory teacher took over the teaching of the class and specific in-class support as a follow up to the analysis of a difficult lesson.

Blanchard et al (1991, p.95) also described the work of advisory teachers, stressing the need for the kind of service advisory teachers offer in the process of following up inspection. They stressed the need for the advisory teacher to be in a position to work flexibly and to have range of strategies so that they ‘can develop a relationship of trust, such that mutual needs can be revealed and met in a mutually supportive way.’ They suggested that:

> It is doubtful whether inspectors can ever get to know the individual circumstances of teachers sufficiently well so as to be able to offer them meaningful support. Inspectors and advisory teachers will have to work closely together if inspection is not to become an isolated activity, alienated from the real concerns of professional development.

The future plans for inspection make it unlikely that this close relationship will develop, especially where inspection is undertaken by a team which is not part of the local authority. Chapter 5 also suggests that advisory teachers may be too few on the ground to provide as much follow up as schools will need.

de Boo (1988, p.16) identified some of the qualities and abilities he felt he needed as an science advisory teacher. There were as follows:

- ability to create an atmosphere of trust;
- credibility as an ordinary classroom teacher;
- adaptability and flexibility;
- sensibility and discretion;
- encouragement and a sense of humour;
- being sure and clear about my own aims - setting achievable objectives - having realistic expectations;
- ability to supply ideas and information.
He also listed the advantages of school-based support. They included:

- working alongside teachers on their 'home ground';
- adapting to the individual teacher's level of experience, expertise and needs;
- relating the science teaching directly to the teacher's own class of children;
- relating the response directly to the conditions pertaining in the school;
- being a positive influence for science in the staffroom (an ambassador);
- being an opportunist and incorporating other cross-curricular activities into the science programme;
- being a guide through difficulties, if any, of policy development and documentation.

The situation in the 4 authorities
In all 4 authorities advisers had a general role with a group of schools for which they were responsible. In authority A every school had an attached inspector and because of the good ratio of inspectors to schools, each attached inspector reckoned to visit his or her schools twice a term. Discussion with headteachers and teachers suggested that this actually happened. A major task for these visits was to discuss the school development plan and to monitor its progress. Advisory teachers all worked to an individual inspector but since the inspectorate was not large enough to have specialists in every curriculum subject, some advisory teachers had some of the role of inspectors, offering specialist advice to schools. Inspectors were heavily involved in headteacher appraisal.

In authority B all secondary schools had a general adviser, known as a pastoral care adviser. All secondary advisers had this role as well as a specialist role but additional primary advisers had recently been recruited and these advisers had become the main point of contact for primary schools. In addition specialist advisers had each taken on the management of a particular task such as looking after newly qualified teachers. The extent to which they visited schools seemed to be variable, according to headteachers, but they were supported by a very full computer programme which gave each adviser a printout of how he or she had spent time each month.

In authority C some advisers had a purely specialist role while others combined a specialism with a general role. The general role had been fairly recently introduced in this authority and there was some doubt about it on the part of both advisers and headteachers, with some thinking it excellent and others thinking it a mistake. Advisers attended virtually all appointments.

In authority D it was the inspectors rather than the advisers who had the general role, leaving the advisers to undertake specialist work. The district inspector was a comparatively recent innovation and the task was to monitor the work of the school and to monitor follow up to inspections. Here again there was doubt as well as approval expressed by headteachers about the value of this role. Advisers, for their part, were responsible for the follow up itself and after each inspection, a link adviser was appointed with this responsibility.
The questionnaire survey

The question which was explored in relation to advice and support was 'How do headteachers and teachers regard the advice and help offered to them by local authority advisory teams?' This involved in the first place questionnaires to headteachers and teachers.

Headteachers' views of advice and support from advisers

Headteachers were asked 16 questions in relation to advice and support from advisers. As in other sections of the questionnaires they were asked to tick one of 4 columns headed 'good service', 'average service', poor service' or 'service not used' 'Good service', 'average service' and 'poor service' attracted 3, 2 and one point respectively and 'service not used' was given no points but was compensated for in the calculations. The graphs on the next page show the average score per item. There is also a fold out table on page 194 which may be consulted during the reading of the discussion of the findings of the questionnaires. Overall the average scores for each authority were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HEADTEACHERS' VIEWS OF ADVICE AND SUPPORT FROM ADVISERS AND INSPECTORS

Fig. 9.1

E9 Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum
E10 Supporting teaching dealing with assessment
E11 Advising on provision for learning and teaching
E12 Advising on provision for pupils with special needs
E13 Supporting headteachers in making the school development plan
E14 Supporting headteachers in implementing the school development plan
E15 Supporting the head and senior staff in their management roles
E16 Providing advice on the management of the curriculum
E17 Working collaboratively with headteachers
E18 Helping headteachers to analyse problems
E19 Working collaboratively with governors
E20 Advising on the appointment of staff
E21 Providing reports on the work of teachers when required
E22 Supporting the school in helping teachers experiencing difficulty
E23 Advising on the design and equipping of new accommodation
E24 Advising on equipment and other resources
Authority A had the highest score for 11 of the 16 items and the lowest score for none with 3 items scoring above 2.50 and no items scoring below 2.00. Authority B had the highest score for one item and one good score. They had the lowest score for 7 items with 6 items having scores below 2.00. Authority C had the highest score for 2 items, one of which was 2.50, the lowest score for 2, and 3 poor scores. Authority D had the highest score for one item, one good score, 7 poor scores and the lowest score for 7 items.

Authority A had the highest average and the graph shows good scores for 3 items and satisfactory scores for the rest. The highest scores were for ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’ (2.54), ‘Supporting the head and senior staff in their management roles’ (2.51) and ‘Working collaboratively with headteachers’ (2.67). The lowest scores were for ‘Advising on provision for pupils with special needs’ (2.02) and ‘Working collaboratively with governors’ (2.08).

Authority B’s best score was for ‘Advising on the appointments of staff’ (2.54) to which they had given a high priority. The lowest scores were for ‘Advising on provision for pupils with special needs’ (1.70) and ‘Working collaboratively with governors’ (1.69).

Authority C had a good score for ‘Supporting teaching dealing with assessment’ (2.50) and poor scores for ‘Advising on provision for pupils with special needs’ (1.78), ‘Working collaboratively with governors’ (1.82) and ‘Providing reports on the work of teachers when required’ (1.78).

Authority D had a good score for ‘Supporting teaching dealing with assessment’ (2.50), and a satisfactory score for ‘Advising on provision for pupils with special needs’ (2.37) and ‘Advising on the appointment of staff’ (2.38). The lowest score was for ‘Providing advice on the management of the curriculum’ (1.81).

Authorities B and C had poor scores for advice on special needs and 3 of the 4 four had poor scores for ‘Working collaboratively with governors’. All four had good or satisfactory scores on ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’, ‘Supporting teaching dealing with assessment’, ‘Working collaboratively with headteachers’, ‘Helping headteachers to analyse problems’ and ‘Advising on the appointment of staff’.

**Headteachers’ views of advice and support from advisory teachers**

Headteachers were asked 7 questions in relation to the contribution of advisory teachers to advice and support. The average scores per item for each of the 4 authorities are shown in the graphs on the next page and in the fold out table on page 194. The average scores for each authority are as follows:

- Authority A: 2.21
- Authority B: 2.24
- Authority C: 2.06
- Authority D: 2.03
HEADTEACHERS’ VIEWS OF 
ADVICE AND SUPPORT 
FROM ADVISORY TEACHERS
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D11 Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection
E9 Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum
E10 Supporting teaching dealing with assessment
E11 Advising on provision for learning and teaching
E12 Advising on provision for pupils with special needs
E22 Supporting the school in helping pupils experiencing difficulty
E24 Advising on equipment and other resources
Authority A had the highest score for two items, the lowest score for one with one item below 2.00, none at 2.50 or above and one poor score. Authority B had the highest score for 4 items no lowest scores with one good score and one poor score. Authority C had the lowest score for 2 with 3 items having scores below 2.00 and no scores above 2.50. Authority D had the highest score for one item and the lowest score for 4 with 3 poor scores and no good scores.

In authority A advisory teachers had a satisfactory score for ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’ (2.42). They had a low score for ‘Advising on provision for pupils with special needs’ (1.89).

Authority B had the best scores overall with a good score for ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’ (2.63) and a satisfactory score for ‘Advising on provision for learning and teaching’ (2.40) and ‘Advising on equipment and other resources’ (2.41). Their lowest scores were for ‘Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection’ (2.00) and ‘Advising on provision for pupils with special needs’ (1.85).

Authority C had a score of 2.36 for ‘Supporting teaching dealing with assessment’. The lowest scores were for ‘Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection’ (1.90), ‘Advising on provision for pupils with special needs’ (1.75) and ‘Supporting the school in helping teachers experiencing difficulty’ (1.92).

Authority D had a score of 2.33 for ‘Supporting teaching dealing with assessment’. The lowest scores were for ‘Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection’ (1.50), ‘Advising on provision for teaching and learning’ (1.93) and ‘Supporting the school in helping teachers experiencing difficulty’ (1.95).

Two authorities, C and D, had scores of below 2.00 for ‘Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection.’ It may be that in these 2 authorities advisory teachers did not play a very large part in the follow up to inspection.

Once again special needs is highlighted in 3 of the 4 authorities as being an area in which headteachers view the support provided as less than adequate. Authority D which has separated inspection and advice again scores badly on ‘Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection’. All 4 authorities have good or satisfactory scores on ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’, and satisfactory scores for ‘Supporting teaching dealing with assessment’ and ‘Advising on equipment and other resources’.

**Teachers’ views of advice and support**

Teachers were asked 12 questions about advice and support and as for headteachers, were asked to tick in one of 4 columns headed ‘good service’, average service’ ‘poor service’ and ‘service not used’ and were scored 3, 2, 1 and 0 respectively with ‘service not used’ compensated for in the calculations. The average scores per item are shown in the graphs on the next page and on the fold out table. Average scores for each authority were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority A</th>
<th>2.09</th>
<th>Authority C</th>
<th>1.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TEACHERS' VIEWS OF ADVICE AND SUPPORT FROM ADVISERS AND INSPECTORS

**AUTHORITY A**

- E1 Providing advice and guidance on work seen
- E2 Making constructive comments
- E3 Helping teachers to plan their work
- E5 Challenging situations
- E6 Helping teachers to think through ideas
- E7 Recommending appropriate resources
- E8 Advising on the use of resources for learning and teaching
- E9 Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum
- E10 Supporting teachers dealing with assessment
- E11 Advising on learning and teaching
- E12 Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs
The scores were generally lower than those for headteachers as they were for inspection. A possible reason for this could be that teachers, because there were far more of them, saw less of advisers than headteachers and therefore viewed them less favourably. There was also possibly the element of threat in any visit unless the teacher knew the adviser well. One primary school teacher made the following comment:

Despite being approachable and generally encouraging towards staff, a classroom teacher is, I believe, wary of his superiors, in this case, advisers. Simply the nature of the beast - big brother is watching you.

Primary teacher, authority B

Authority A had the highest score for 7 of the 12 items and the lowest score for 2 with 4 items scoring below 2.00 and one above 2.50. Authority B had the highest score for 4 items and the lowest score for 4 with 5 items having poor scores and no good scores. Authority C had the lowest score for 5, no highest score or score above 2.50 and 8 items with poor scores. Authority D had the highest score for one item, no scores above 2.50, the lowest score for 2 items, and scores below 2.00 for 4 items.

Authority A had a satisfactory score for ‘Making constructive comments’ (2.30) and a good score for ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’ (2.51) but low scores for ‘Helping teachers to plan their work’ (1.81) ‘Challenging situations’ (1.90), ‘Recommending appropriate resources’ (1.90) and ‘Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs’ (1.91).

Authority B’s highest score was for ‘Making constructive comments’ (2.35) but they had low scores for ‘Providing advice and guidance on work seen’ (1.88), ‘Challenging situations’ (1.77), ‘Advising on learning and teaching’ (1.88) and ‘Providing advice on how to deal with special needs’ (1.54).

The highest scores for Authority C were for ‘Making constructive comments’ (2.21) and ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’ (2.23). The lowest scores were for ‘Helping teachers to plan their work’ (1.86), ‘Helping teachers identify and set achievable targets’ (1.87), ‘Challenging situations’ (1.83) ‘Advising on the use of resources for learning and teaching’ (1.80) and ‘Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs’ (1.80).

Authority D’s highest scores were for ‘Making constructive comments’ (2.26) ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’ (2.19) and ‘Supporting teachers dealing with assessment’ (2.17). The lowest was ‘Challenging situations’ (1.82).

Once again poor scores for special needs were common to 3 of the 4 authorities and ‘Challenging situations’ had poor scores from all 4 authorities. It will be remembered that this was an item which some teachers said they did not understand (cf.p.128). Three of the 4 have satisfactory scores for ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’ and
authority A has a good score. All 4 have satisfactory scores for ‘Making constructive comments.’ Three of the 4 have satisfactory scores for ‘Supporting teaching dealing with assessment’ and authority C has a poor score.

There were similarities to the findings of the headteacher questionnaire on their views of advisers and inspectors. They gave poor scores for special needs in 2 of the 4 authorities and 3 had satisfactory scores for ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’ with a good score from authority A. Teachers also gave satisfactory scores in all 4 authorities for ‘Making constructive comments’.

**Teachers’ views of advice and support from advisory teachers**

Teachers were asked the same 12 questions about the work of advisory teachers as they had been asked about advisers and they were scored in the same way. Average scores per item are shown in the graphs on the next page and on the fold out table on page 194.

Average scores for each authority were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TEACHERS’ VIEWS OF ADVICE AND SUPPORT
BY ADVISORY TEACHERS
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E1 Providing advice and guidance on work seen
E2 Making constructive comments
E3 Helping teachers to plan their work
E4 Helping teachers to identify and set achievable targets
E5 Challenging situations
E6 Helping teachers to think through ideas
E7 Recommending appropriate resources
E8 Advising on the use of resources for teaching and learning
E9 Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum
E10 Supporting teaching dealing with assessment
E11 Advising on learning and teaching
E12 Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs
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Teachers’ average scores were higher for advisory teachers than for advisers and their scores for advisory teachers were higher than those from headteachers for advisory teachers.

Authority A had the highest score for 3 of the 12 items and the lowest score for one with one item scoring above 2.50 and one below 2.00. Authority B had the highest score for 8 items and the lowest score for none with 5 good scores and one item having a poor score. Authority C had the highest score for no items; the lowest score for 5 items, no good scores and one poor score. Authority D had the highest score for 2 items, lowest score for 6, with no scores above 2.50 and scores below 2.00 for 2 items.

Authority A again had a reasonable result in this part of the survey with a good score in one item and satisfactory scores in 10. The highest score was for ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’ (2.64) and the lowest score was ‘Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs’ (1.94).

Authority B had good scores for 5 items. The highest of these were for ‘Making constructive comments’ (2.70), ‘Recommending appropriate resources’ (2.79) and ‘Advising on the use of resources for learning and teaching’ (2.67). There was only one poor score for ‘Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs’ (1.76). They also had the best scores for advisory teachers from headteachers.

Authority C had satisfactory scores for 11 items. Their highest scores were for ‘Making constructive comments’ (2.38), ‘Recommending appropriate resources’ (2.36), ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’ (2.45). The lowest score was once again for ‘Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs’ (1.74).

Authority D’s highest scores were for ‘Helping teachers to think through ideas’ (2.38), ‘Recommending appropriate resources’ (2.40), ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’ (2.39). The lowest scores were for ‘Helping teachers to plan their work’ (1.96) and ‘Challenging situations’ (1.94).

All 4 authorities had good or satisfactory scores for ‘Making constructive comments’, ‘Helping teachers to think through ideas’, ‘Recommending appropriate resources’, ‘Advising on the use of resources for learning and teaching’ and ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’. All 4 had comparatively low scores for ‘Challenging situations.’. Three of the 4 had low scores for ‘Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs.’

Whereas teachers’ views of advisers scored lower than headteachers’ views, the same was not true where advisory teachers were concerned. It could be that the following comment by a teacher gives an explanation of this:

My overall sense (being isolated and a deputy) is that much of the contact with the inspectorate is through the senior management and the grass roots teacher has more contact with advisory teachers.

Primary school teacher, authority A
There were 4 areas in which the same questions were asked of all groups. Of these, only ‘Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum’ had good or satisfactory scores throughout, ‘Supporting teachers dealing with assessment’ had only one poor score, however, with the rest good or satisfactory. ‘Advising on pupils with special needs’ had 11 of the 16 scores below 2.00 and no scores above 2.50.

Nine per cent of the scores of headteachers for advisers were good compared with 2% in the teachers’ scores. Twenty five per cent of the scores of headteachers for advisers were poor, compared with 44% for teachers’ views of this group.

Four per cent of the scores of headteachers for advisory teachers were good, compared with 12% for teachers. Twenty nine per cent of the scores of headteachers for advisory teachers were poor, compared with 10% from teachers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores in this table are the average scores per item. Bold type: The highest scores for that item in the questionnaire. Italic: The lowest scores for that item in the questionnaire. Underlined: Scores of 2.50 and above. Rectangle outline: Scores below 2.00.
Comments in questionnaires

Both headteachers and teachers were given the opportunity to comment in the questionnaires. Of the total number of 153 comments made by headteachers and teachers, 83 were concerned with advice and support. Very different numbers of comments were made by the different authorities. Authority A’s headteachers and teachers made 34 comments, authority B made 30, authority C, 7 and authority D, 12.

There were 40 positive comments made about the support offered by inspectors, advisers and advisory teachers. Twenty five of these were made about advisers and inspectors and 15 about advisory teachers. Seventeen positive comments were made about the service in authority A, 10 in authority B, 7 in authority C and 6 in authority D. The following are examples:

Advisers

As a new headteacher I have found the inspectorate very helpful and supportive.
Primary school headteacher, authority A

We have had some superb advisers. These and their retired colleagues have raised my spirits and encouraged me and my colleagues in our work here and elsewhere, over many years.
Primary school headteacher, authority B

Advisory teachers

I see the advisory teacher for ROA (Records of Achievement) frequently and value highly his constructive, thoughtful help and comments. He is most supportive.
Special school teacher, authority A

Knowing advisory teachers are there for referral is extremely valuable. Often they are quick to respond to individual school needs when approached.
Primary school teacher, authority A

There were 21 negative comments. Four of these were from authority A, 5 from authority B, 4 from authority C and 8 from authority D. All of these comments were about advisers. The following are examples of these:

Some teachers have found certain situations threatening and unhelpful.
Junior school teachers, authority A

Generally they lack credibility. Most lack recent experience of management. They are not ‘realists.’
Primary school headteacher, authority B

I find the services difficult to evaluate since they have been provided either very rarely or by such limited numbers of advisers that it is almost impossible to think in terms of average performance.
Primary school teacher, authority C

Have only made use of maths and music and special support services. Advice and in-service in English and science of a very poor standard. Assessment course patronising.
Primary school teacher, authority D
There were 33 mixed comments where the writer had both good and critical things to say. Twenty-five of these were about advisers and 8 about advisory teachers. Eighteen were made about the team in authority A, 7 about the teams in authorities B and D and one about the team in authority C. The following are examples:

I have seen a great improvement in the service offered by the inspectorate during the last few years. Advisory staff are at a disadvantage as few have any experience let alone expertise to offer the early years.  
*Nursery school headteacher, authority A*

Sometimes advisers pay fleeting visits and pop into a classroom, say a quick hello, scan the room and that’s it. One adviser was absolutely spot on. She provided everything on the list and the most valuable thing was helping to plan and organise with the hindsight of her experience. There was time for feedback, questions etc. Another adviser didn’t really give clear enough objectives and consequently the planning for him to come in was difficult because he spoke in such vague terms.  
*Primary school teacher authority B*

Generally we have found advisory teachers very cooperative, helpful and practical. Our district inspector for the past two years has been supportive with constructive and useful advice. A team of two county inspectors were not so constructive and certainly did not seem prepared to listen or understand particular problems. They left a demoralised staff and very angry governors.  
*Primary school headteacher, authority D*

There were 22 understanding comments which sympathised with the pressures on the advisory service. Eight of these were from authority A, 7 from authority B, 5 from authority C and 2 from authority D. The following are examples:

My dealings with the inspectorate in the last three years have been very positive. However, I think, like everything else, administration is taking them away from schools.  
*Primary school teacher, authority A*

We have good advisers and advisory teachers but I am of the opinion that they are under pressure to implement new legislation and have to take on too many roles.  
*Primary school headteacher, authority B*

I think that given the constraints placed upon them (i.e. time, other demands etc.) the advisory service does an excellent job. There is not enough expertise, but this is not their fault - they are spread too thinly.  
*Primary school headteacher, authority C*

In general inspection and advice teams have been excellent. As in everything you can’t please all the people all the time. Recently their duties have been enormous and seem to have changed every month. I’m not surprised the service they give can be below standard at times. It’s hard enough for everyone these days.  
*Primary school headteacher, authority D*

As with inspection the issue of credibility was a concern, both in terms of primary/secondary specialisms and also in terms of the adviser or advisory teacher’s ability to recognise the pressures on primary school teachers. There was also concern from those
authorities where the general adviser role was comparatively new. Headteachers also noted that some lacked the management experience which would enable them to advise headteachers. There were no such comments from secondary school headteachers or teachers. There were 8 comments on this altogether, 5 from authority A, 2 from authority B and one each from authorities C and D.

Difficulties arise when inspectors or advisory teachers with secondary experience are involved in the primary phase. Their lack of understanding or breadth of experience can be limiting to discussions. 
*Primary school headteacher, authority A*

Advisers are being asked to take on too many roles. Specialist advisers seem excellent in their own fields but run into difficulties with credibility, enthusiasm and inspiration when compelled to move into other areas.
*Primary school teacher, authority B*

Many have specialist skills and give an excellent service in the areas of expertise but when acting as general advisers may have little or no experience in some areas of work e.g. a skill in the teaching of science at age 10 - 16 but little experience with infants e.g. may have been secondary teachers before being promoted to advisers.
*Infant school headteacher, authority C*

So many advisers and inspectors are specialists in their field they seem to be unaware of the demands placed on teachers of young children, who are expected to take on board all the ideas of the specialists, each of whom is unaware of what the others in the advisory service are recommending, often in contradiction to each other. Very few advisers are qualified early years practitioners and their advice is often inappropriate. Advisory teachers whose specialism is early years’ education have more understanding.
*Nursery school teacher, authority D*

There were a small number of more general comments which did not fit in with any of the categories above:

In general the advisory service provides excellent support for teachers but has, in the light of so much educational change, been required to deliver such support when teachers are confused and demoralised.
*Primary school teacher, authority A*

Very good service but little opportunity for us to use them.
*Primary school teacher, authority B*

I think my staff have received more high quality support and advice from advisory teachers than inspectors or advisers. With advisory teachers we have found that those from primary backgrounds have been more helpful than those from a specialist background.
*Primary school headteacher, authority D*

**Evidence from interviews**

**Positive views**

Sixty two positive comments were made about the work of the advisory service in their authority by teachers and headteachers. Twelve of these were from authority A, 11 from
authority B, 19 from authority C and 20 from authority D. Twenty two of the comments referred to advisory teachers rather than advisers. The following are examples.

I certainly, coming into the authority new, found it very uplifting actually to have a supportive network that existed and was in place. In a bigger authority you don’t see them quite so often. You don’t feel the emotional support.

*Primary school headteacher, authority A*

R comes in and he’s been with my senior management team at the end of a biennial review and he has talked honestly and openly and we have. He’s sat in on our meetings. Nobody’s hidden anything. He knows the way we think and he understands us. He has summed us up and he’s sensitive enough, I think, to let us move through that. He’s the kind of person you can pick up the phone and say, ‘We need that.’

*Secondary school headteacher, authority B*

JC and the secondary team ... they have made it their business to know the legislation better than we have and they’ve given us advice based on that expert knowledge, but they know us well and so they’ve tempered it in that way and I think this preparation for SATs has been absolutely first class.

*Secondary school headteacher, authority C*

I’ve had a superb experience with an advisory teacher. We were assessing our reading books and there was a whole batch of totally inappropriate books in the reception class and they really ought to go. I’d been niggling away and peeped in and thought, ‘Well it’s going to come to a holiday and a bin bag’, but I thought I’d have one last shot, so I got the reading support team in and she was one of the ‘Don’t really need these, do we? Right?’ and actually made the teacher agree they had to go.

*Primary school headteacher, authority D*

In my last school ... there were a lot of staff who’d been there a long time and they hadn’t been much involved with advisers or advisory teachers. That just a new face in the small school environment brought about all kinds of dynamics which were nothing to do with the guy - but it brought different aspects. Even the fact that he was a man and these 4 ladies had been there about 15 years. You know, it brought all sorts of results in terms of the children. You know they had never seen a man in a teaching role, neither the staff or the children and it really did bring about a lot of change.

*Primary school headteacher, authority B*

**Negative views**

Thirty four negative points were made. It is interesting that only one came from authority A and authority C which had 19 positive points also had 21 negative points. Authority B had 5 negative points and authority D had 7. Only one of these concerned an advisory teacher. The following are examples.

I find the few times I’ve spoken to them it’s always been - I’m saying things and all of a sudden I get tripped, you know - I have a very bad view of inspectors and I’m sure there are very good inspectors and bad ....but from my point of view I see them as foes and I don’t think that’s the way it should be. I think they should be there to help me.

*Junior school teacher, authority A*

In the past people have seen advisers as someone who comes occasionally to see what we are doing, pops in the classroom for five minutes, looks, says something complimentary and then leaves for another six months. Many teachers felt uncomfortable with this as they were unsure of the purpose, what was being looked at, what was being thought and what was being written, reported and stored elsewhere.

*Primary school headteacher, authority B*
My advisory teacher got off on the wrong foot. She had been secondary trained and the first introduction to the development group was... when she waved documents at them and sort of told them how powerful she was, that she had got the documents and of course they couldn’t have them yet and ever after that I find it very difficult to get my year 2 teachers to go to any of her meetings. So we did not have a very happy experience with the advisory teacher attached to our group.  
*Primary school headteacher, authority C*

Because they’re so busy they’re not as meticulous as they ought to be. So you’ll send them invitations and some you know will reply, some don’t bother.  
*Lower school headteacher, authority D*

I think it’s linked to trust and to be frank I don’t trust my district inspector. I don’t like the fact that anything you say is taken down and recorded on his clipboard which you are then no party to afterwards.  
*Primary school headteacher, authority D*

**Mixed views**

Thirty one points were made which were partly positive and partly negative. Six of these concerned advisory teachers. Five mixed points were made in authority A, 4 in authority B, 12 in authority C and 10 in authority D. The following are examples.

I’ve got a great respect for them in some aspects of what they can observe and what they see going on and observer/classroom techniques. I feel a little bit resentful when they come and try and say, ‘Why aren’t you doing this? Why aren’t you doing that?’ when they’ve never actually tried doing it in practice themselves.  
*Secondary school head of department, authority A*

Many aspects of the adviser’s role are recognised and appreciated by schools like appointments, support, INSET, provision and promotion of good practice but there are areas which staff feel could be improved upon. Many teachers feel that visits by advisers that are clearly outlined with positive target setting would be more beneficial than the rather vague general visits made in the past.  
*Primary school headteacher, authority B*

I think sometimes the balance isn’t clear. You know, we’re not quite clear. I think it’s to do with the authority’s progressive philosophy, which I do go along with. ... I do think they could advise us more and we wouldn’t be hurt. I mean we’ve got plenty to do and you could say no. So I suppose I would say that some advisers are more competent than others as well as more on top of their subject.  
*Secondary school headteacher, authority C*

It does vary with the quality of the individuals and it’s ever so difficult because sometimes we’re quite clear in terms of our development and where we want the help. For instance when we do special needs, we targeted each area in turn and we were given the appropriate person, but some of them were less useful evidence and then we had staff saying at the end of it, ‘You know, we could have done some of that ourselves.’  
*Lower school headteacher, authority D*

**Evidence about the effects of change and pressures on the service**

There were 11 points made about the effects of change and the pressures on advisers. One of these was from authority A, one from authority B, 6 from authority C and 3 from authority D. The following are examples:
Q  Do you feel, those of you who’ve been in the authority some time, that there has been a loss of support because of the accent on inspection. Do you feel you’re getting less support?

A  I personally think we’re getting more.

Q  So it’s probably better organised?

A  Hang on a minute. Not necessarily more, more effective support.

*Primary school headteachers, authority A*

I’ve noticed that there aren’t so many visits in school made now as there were three years ago and there were less 3 years ago than 5 years ago and that, we presume, is the changing role, because 4 years ago we would expect at least 6 people in per half term and before that probably more, but now it’s been reduced and so we don’t see them.

*Junior school headteacher, authority B*

I think another thing is the rate of change in the advisory service. It’s only 3 years since I was appointed to a maths team. There were subject teams. That lasted one year and then it changed and the development group and the advisers moved to become general advisers, although most of them initially would be appointed with a subject specialism like English.

*Primary school headteacher, authority C*

If they’ve got to inspect a quarter of the schools in (the authority) every year to get the 4 year cycle out, then I’m unhappy in the long term (about) the perceptions that they actually have in terms of the county as a whole....I think that schools have always benefited more from advice than inspection.

*Secondary school headteacher, authority D*

**Evidence concerning credibility**

The comments given earlier showed concern on the part of the primary schools with the credibility of the advisory service. This was also evident in what was said in interviews. Eleven points about credibility were made altogether. Four of these came from authority A, one from authority B, 6 from authority C and none from authority D. Points made about the credibility of advisory teachers tended to be positive. (cf.pp.166,172,173)

Bear in mind that the inspectors which we have in the authority have not experienced as heads or not had direct experience of LMS or the National Curriculum, which they recognise and advisory teachers,...if they’ve been appointed recently, have been in schools where LMS is in its infancy or they’ve been involved with the initial implementation of the National Curriculum and (that) therefore means that when there are advisory teachers in school what they’ve got to say when they’re in school is relevant and their experience is relevant. Therefore there’s greater empathy between them and the class teacher.

*Primary school headteacher, authority A*

Their (advisory teachers) credibility is usually one of coming from a class - they’ve had class teaching experience and it’s very much that they’re coming to help me as a teacher, support my ability within the classroom and to provide fresh eyes and input in very practical terms.

*Primary school headteacher, authority A*

I don’t think it’s quite a question of enhancing credibility so much as establishing it. There simply isn’t any. And that matters to us particularly in the primary sector at a time when the National Curriculum has turned over so much. They’ve either got to show it up front straightaway at the first meeting speak with some cogency and some real practical advantage or don’t speak at all, because the damage they will reap thereafter ....will never be able to replace that loss of credibility. The staff won’t wear it.

*Primary school headteacher, authority C*
Evidence of the wish to move to consultancy
There were 9 comments about wanting the service to move further towards consultancy. Two of these were from authority A, none from authority B, 5 from authority C and 2 from authority D. The following are examples.

I think there’s been a great improvement in the input from the advisory ...In the past there’s been the problem of...resistance to advisory input. They’ve come in and they’ve expected that the school should fit in with their view, whereas my view is that the advisory teacher has to fit in with what we’re doing and understand that we all have different ways of doing things, different policies and therefore if they’re going to come in to give some input it has to be on our terms.
Primary school headteacher, authority A

If I were a client purchasing private services, you know, inspection and advice, I would be saying, ‘Fine, inspect my maths curriculum and I want my advice contained within this framework’ and I would specify the way I wanted it so that I could use it. What I’m not getting as a client at the moment and do not see the offer of it, is that kind of system that I can pick up and run with.
Middle school headteacher, authority C

What I would like to purchase is a model similar to a management consultancy and the term consultancy I think, embodies what I’m looking for. The management consultant comes in as a critical friend, as very much more critical than friend and produces a very clear sighted report and recommendations which you can take or leave as your circumstances provide.
Primary school headteacher, authority C

Specific kinds of help and advice
A number of points were made about the kind of help and advice which teachers and headteachers wanted from the advisory service. Particular areas mentioned were curriculum, personnel matters - particularly appointments and staff problems, career advice for teachers and acting as a sounding board for the headteacher. The following are examples.

New technology I think. Speaking for myself, it’s an area that I never thought I would have to teach as much as we are going to and I feel fairly ill-equipped and I would welcome any help and advice and I think a lot of primary teachers feel that way as well.
Primary school teacher authority A

I would like to know that we could buy in expertise on science or on any other subject, so we could buy in curriculum expertise
Junior school headteacher authority B

Mine’s personnel. In a falling roll situation it’s certainly, you know ...the most stressful thing I’ve ever had to deal with in my whole career and once again ...I had support. I needed support on that one more than I’ve ever needed support. So for me the personnel has been the most valuable.
Secondary school headteacher, authority D

To be able to offer professional consultations to the other staff. I think that’s very important because if you’ve got a member of staff who’s trying to gain other posts and is getting to a dead end, then I think it’s important to be able to offer some kind of professional interview.
Primary school headteacher, authority D
I think actually I find it is a sounding board, because I do find in headship that there’s so much change at the moment and I’m struggling with coming to terms with what’s the right direction, the vision which I should have for the school, trying to clarify my own thinking on this.

Primary school headteacher, authority D

General evidence
A number of interesting points were made which did not fit into any of the categories above. Some examples are as follows:

I think in a small borough they (inspectors) have quite an important part to play in linking the schools in the borough with what’s going on nationally. I really would like to see more of that.

Secondary school teacher authority A

I think there’s an advantage in a small authority where you actually get to know your inspectors quite well. I was in a large authority as a deputy head and I only met one inspector for ten minutes in two years. I know coming in as a new head, inspectors are keen to meet a new head, but in one term I’ve actually met and talked at length with half a dozen inspectors and staff know the inspectors. Everybody knows their names and heads of department know them. That’s something to do with being a small authority.

Secondary school headteacher, authority A

Clarity and common purpose for the visit will help. I think that’s what’s been wrong in the past. It’s been so vague and open ended has the visit that there’s never developed that exchange of information openly. It’s always been reserved because you didn’t know what was going to happen or what they might see or what they were looking for. If they can get that right there’ll be a much better exchange of information, better exchange of ideas and therefore there’ll be a much more positive outcome.

Primary school headteacher, authority B

Well I’ve found that when advisory teachers have been working in a selection of schools within an area there have been links for us between the schools. We’ve shared. The advisory teacher may say, ‘At such and such a school they’re doing something very similar’ and there’s been an exchange of ideas through the teachers... The children shared as well as the teachers.

Primary school headteacher, authority B

Evidence from interviews with advisers and advisory teachers

Advisers and advisory teachers also had views about advice and support. There was evidence of concern about the best way of doing the job, whether it was inspecting or advising. It is interesting that most of these comments, chosen because they illustrate concern with aspects of the work, come from authority D where advice and inspection are separated. It would seem possible that the separation has made members of the team more concerned about how they operate.

I know (our role is) going to centre on subjects as long as the National Curriculum forces us down that route of having a sub-curriculum that’s viewed in that way but I think there are all sorts of other issues that require us to have a broader perspective that schools find valuable so that you’re more than just the subject adviser. You can give that little bit more when you’re talking about other things whether it be cross-curriculum things or assessment.

Adviser, authority D
We’re not necessarily that good at evaluating. You know, we come away with impressions and we hope we’re doing a reasonable job but are we really and what does that look like across the service?

Adviser, authority C

The art which I’m still (developing) - and I’m still not quite there, is ... be positive whilst leaving behind that seed corn. I mean normally there’s plenty to be positive about these days wherever you go but that sort of seed corn will bear some fruit at a later date. I don’t know if you can remember the television series Columbo but I was saying that I was increasingly falling into the Columbo mode though I wasn’t wearing the old mac and as I left I said, ‘Oh, by the way ‘ as this thought came to me as I was practically out of the door and another three minutes would follow which was just the sort of something to unsettle the situation there.

Inspector, authority D

I think that’s very important that whilst we’re confirming good practice at the same time I think we’re genuinely trying to be provocative in the right sort of way but one would hope the experience that you build up ... again through lots of schools, actually gives you a range of data on which to draw. Whatever issue you’re talking about you’ve probably seen something different elsewhere, better, worse, or whatever, that allows you to say, ‘Have you thought of - - ?’ or whatever.

Inspector, authority D

I think drawing people together from different education establishments within phases and cross phase into a useful dialogue, that is an area which I think without us wouldn’t happen. Each school would be inclined to become more insular and we act as a focus to enlarge the discussion.

Adviser, authority D

I think it’s important to understand where (teachers) are in terms of their own development, so really understanding their kind of professional person and starting there and sort of nudging them forward, so that you’re offering them something that’s a little bit wonderful but far enough so that they’ll be able to cope with that.

Advisory teacher, authority D

Advisers, like headteachers and teachers were also concerned about their credibility:

There is this credibility issue, the fact that most of the people who have got secondary experience and some of the old timers in the primary heads find it quite difficult to think that people might have a contribution to make even if they’ve not had the identical experience.

Chief Inspector, authority A

I think a particularly sensitive issue is this primary/secondary division thing. I think there are issues which go across phase which all colleagues in the service rightly would be involved in but I think it’s too easy to make assumptions about experience in one phase fitting in another. I certainly do not feel qualified to advise on certain aspects of secondary education because my teaching background is primary although there are other issues which I can see are very similar, the question of continuity and progression,what happens at the point of transfer and what might be done to facilitate that. The same issues come up whether you’re talking about infant/junior transfer or middle/upper. But in terms of curriculum or even teaching style, because the timetabling and specialist teaching in secondary schools is so different, I don’t think I’m the best person to advise.

Adviser, authority D
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Summary

Findings in relation to the question asked

1  Overall it could be said that headteachers and teachers viewed advisers and advisory teachers more positively than negatively though many had mixed views. They were concerned about the pressures on the advisory service and the effect of these on work with schools.

2  The average scores for teachers’ views of advisers were marginally lower in each case than those for headteachers’ views of advisers. However, there were only 4 cases where they were commenting on the same item. In all of these the teachers’ rating of advisers was somewhat lower than that of headteachers. There were 6 good scores (9%) in the headteachers’ scores and only one (2%) in the teachers’ scores. There were 16 items (25%) where the headteachers’ scores were below 2.00 and 21 items (44%) where this was the case for the teachers.

3  Teachers’ ratings for advisory teachers were above their ratings for advisers and also above the ratings of headteachers for advisory teachers. There was 1 good score (4%) among the headteachers’ results and and 6 (12%) among those from teachers. Eight of the 28 items in the headteachers’ questionnaire about advisory teachers scored below 2.00 (29%) but only 5 of the 48 items (10%) in the teachers’ questionnaire. It should be noted that only 4 items were common to both questionnaires.

4  In the 4 items which were common to all the questionnaires there was a measure of agreement in the scores for ‘Supporting work in the National Curriculum’ where all the scores were above 2.00 and ‘Supporting teaching dealing with assessment’ where only one score was below 2.00. ‘Advising on teaching and learning’ had 3 scores below 2.00 and 2 of these were among the teachers’ views of advisers. Authorities B and Chad poor scores for advice on special needs wherever this occurred and authority A had poor scores for this item for advisory teachers from headteachers and teachers and for advisers from teachers. Eleven out of the 16 scores for this item were below 2.00 All the scores above 2.00 for supporting special needs were from authority D.

5  Authority A had the best scores from headteachers for advice and support from advisers for 11 items out of the 16 and for 6 items out of 12 in the teachers’ views. Authority B had the best scores from headteachers for advice and support from advisory teachers for 4 out of the 7 items and for 8 out the 12 items for teachers.
Other findings

1 There was concern about the changes in the advisory service and the pressures on advisers. In most cases comments were made in the context of the service offering less than previously. The exception to this was authority A where headteachers felt that they were getting more high quality attention.

2 There were frequent references to credibility. These concerned advisers with a secondary background who had not done enough homework about primary schools, advisers lack of experience of actually teaching the National Curriculum and specialist advisers lack of appreciation of the pressures on primary school teachers. All these comments came from the primary sector. Advisers also showed concern about credibility (cf.pp.166,172,173).

3 There were a number of comments about the need for advisory teams to move to a consultancy role. Headteachers felt that they were now in a different position vis-a-vis advisers and should be able to ask for the kind of advice they wanted.

4 Specific kinds of advice and help wanted included curriculum advice and advice on personnel. Headteachers wanted an adviser whom they could use as a sounding board for discussing ideas and plans. There was also a need for someone who could offer career advice to staff.

5 There were several comments from headteachers in authority A about the benefits of being in a small authority where you could know the advisory staff really well.

6 Advisers and advisory teachers showed concern about the best way to go about their work and how it could be evaluated and improved. They felt that they needed a broad perspective on education and not simply a view from one subject. They thought that it was important to make people think by being provocative to some extent. They valued being able to draw together people from different schools and different phases of education. Advisory teachers stressed the importance of starting where the teachers were.
10 THE KEY AREAS - TEACHER DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

The third key area, like the others, is in a state of change. Hitherto most local authorities through their advisory service had set up a central core of courses from which teachers and schools could select those they felt to be most relevant. A number of authorities, including one in the the present study, have devolved the money for courses to schools who may buy places in the courses available. They may also use the money to set up their own training activities and this is increasingly the pattern. Advisers and advisory teachers are now spending a good deal of the time they spend on teacher development on providing in-house courses for particular staffs of schools or for groups of schools and this would seem to be one pattern for the future.

It should also be remembered that teacher development is not simply a matter of courses. Teachers develop their work in all kinds of ways in the process of doing it and advisers and advisory teachers help this process by the comments they make and the advice they offer.

Relevant literature

Oldroyd and Hall (1988, p.24) made the following comment about the work of advisers in the in-service training of teachers:

The LEA advisory team not only plays a central role in the process of policy formation and implementation but it is also well placed to add a broader dimension to the often more idiosyncratic viewpoint expressed in the training priorities identified by individual institutions. LEA advisers are in the almost unique position of being able to visit a wide range of schools within the authority and to develop an overview of the school curriculum as a whole.

Bolam et al (1978) found that 93% of their respondents spent some time on general in-service courses and 80% on follow up activities. Many expressed frustration at the lack of time to follow up the work they had done in the classrooms of those attending the courses and felt that they needed more advisory teachers to undertake this role. Over half (52%) wanted to spend more time on following up courses. Most advisers saw their major role as a trainer. Very few saw themselves in a consultant role.

Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991, p.85) noted that a great deal of in-service education was ineffective. It did not provide the kind of on-going interactive learning which was needed.
They pointed out that:

Learning by doing, concrete role models, meetings with resource consultants and fellow implementers, practice of the behaviour and the fits and starts of cumulative, ambivalent, gradual self-confidence, all constitute a process of coming to see the meaning of change more clearly.

They suggested that both pressure and support are needed if teachers were to make proposed changes their own. Teachers were normally ambivalent about change and needed support in getting through the first stages.

They were critical of ‘one-shot workshops’ as largely ineffective. There needed to be involvement in planning of those for whom the course was intended and there needed to be follow up and support. Effective courses involved teachers trying out the ideas suggested in their classrooms and returning to the course to discuss their findings. It was also helpful if they observed in each other’s classrooms and discussed problems with each other. They needed a wide variety of approaches.

Garnett (1977, p.33) noted teachers while not denying the need for advisers to organise and run courses felt that advisers were inclined ‘to run the courses they wanted to run, irrespective of the needs of the teachers’. Her article foreshadows some future developments.

The teachers felt it would be better to run fewer courses, geared more closely to the needs of teachers and followed up properly afterwards. Many felt that such courses would be of more value if they were run for the whole staff of a school, or for a group of schools, located in the school and geared to its individual needs.

Eraut (1992, p.3,4) is currently studying in-service education in a small sample of schools. He suggests that the following might be ways of securing effective INSET (In-Service Education and Training).

- Appreciate the different forms of INSET and their contributions and the need to facilitate and fund these in befitting ways
- Supporting sequences of INSET and recognising pre-classroom outcomes
- Continuity of contact between schools and their INSET support services
- The need to monitor
  a) the recent changes in the relationships between LEAs, other providers and schools on the pattern of INSET activities
  b) the effects within schools of recent alterations in the locus of decision making about how INSET money is allocated
- The need of schools to see INSET provision as part of the whole picture of resource planning - long and medium term planning - the SDP (school development plan) and targets
- The importance of external inputs into INSET needs appraisal
- Seeing INSET as a consequence of processes and events with intermediate outcomes
- Using formative evaluation within sequences to improve the final outcomes in classrooms
- Monitoring and evaluating classroom outcomes
Ingvarson (1982, p.92) made a follow up study of the effects of in-service work in Victoria, Australia. He noted that there was good reason from the study to believe that enthusiasm and professional satisfaction played a considerable part in a teacher’s effectiveness and that these were qualities which could be fostered by in-service education. Teachers felt strongly that they should play a part in determining the nature and content of in-service activities. They were divided on the value of one-day conferences but those who responded to the questions on residential conferences were in favour of them by a proportion of more than three to one.

The teachers in Ingvarson’s study expressed preference for small group discussion and workshop situations and fewer lectures. They also echoed some of the comments made by teachers in the present study in saying that they were concerned about course leaders and lecturers who were not in touch with classroom realities.

He noted that ‘Teachers were unequivocal in their opinion that it is contact with other teachers that is of greatest value to them in gaining and using teaching ideas.’ However, in-service education featured prominently as a source of new ideas and the means of putting them into practice.

Teachers were asked about the reasons why they changed practice. The main reason given was self-motivation (39%) but 23% gave in-service activities and 6% gave visiting consultants/local advisers/resource persons/curriculum and research officers. Only 0.3% gave inspectors!

Golby and Fish (1980) wrote of the movement to school based in-service work and the role of the consultant in this context. Their concerns are surprisingly apt for today’s climate considering that they were written some 13 years ago. They pointed out that the person entering a school as a consultant was in a different role from the adviser’s traditional role as a representative of the employer. He or she must face the fact that hidden agendas stemming from the internal politics of the school would impinge on the work and that people coming to any in-service programme would have their own reasons for being present and would want to get different things from the experience. The sponsors for consultancy might be several and might each have different expectations. They recommended that a good deal of time should be taken in negotiating a contract and that a variety of people should be consulted about it, not simply the headteacher who would have his or her own agenda. They also suggested that two people working together have advantages over the lone consultant.

Morris (1990) described an in-service project where the advisory teachers running it spent the following week visiting each of the classrooms of the teachers attending the course to spend time observing in the classroom and following this by discussion with the teacher.
Initial evaluation of this noted that teachers valued the extra support back in their own schools and the fact that they were not left to try out new ideas and approaches in isolation. They appreciated the opportunity to extend their thinking about the most recent session of the course and to think again about it in the company of the advisory teacher.

The article pointed out that more objective evaluation of this project was needed. HMI (1988, p.30) spoke of the contribution made by advisory teachers to INSET:

Advisory teachers were used extensively for LEA provided INSET. Invariably their sessions were well prepared with resources carefully chosen and with supporting handouts for teachers to take back to their schools.

Matthews (1990) studied the work of advisory teachers, whom he saw primarily as change agents achieving change through their work in the classroom and through in-service work both school-focused and more general. He used questionnaires and then interviewed very small groups of inspectors and advisory teachers and surveyed the views of headteachers, probably within one borough authority although this is not stated. His findings, though interesting, are of value only as statements made by individuals, because of the small size of the samples and because he gives no information about how the samples were selected. The results are also set out in tables which are unexplained and are not clear to the reader as they stand. There are, nevertheless, many interesting points made and some are confirmed by other studies (for example Harland 1989).

He found that among the advisory teachers, only a few thought that their previous experience had equipped them as change agents. They tended to rely too much on the opinions of senior management in schools as a means of assessing the needs of teachers for in-service work and support and few used evidence which might be gained from observing teachers and talking with pupils. He noted that the organisation of any school, its climate and culture affected the ability of teachers to take from any training opportunities offered but found that the sample of advisory teachers were not aware of this. Few of them appeared to have a clear rationale for their ways of working. He found that the predominant model for working with teachers was that of ‘collaborative control’ in which teacher and advisory teacher shared the class. Advisory teachers tended not to consider a variety of ways of working and select those which seemed appropriate for the task in hand. They also used a very limited range of methods used for evaluating their work, mainly talking with the teacher and questioning the children or giving them questionnaires.

One outcome of this study was a number of recommendations for training of advisory teachers. Among a long list of possible areas, important points seemed to be training in
counselling skills, making contracts with schools, the role and function of the change agent, designing and delivering INSET, inter-personal skills, action research training and knowledge of organisation development.

There was also concern and critical comments from headteachers about the advisory teachers lack of information about current developments both with the LEA and elsewhere. This confirmed the finding of Harland (1990) that advisory teachers found communication within the LEA a problem. This finding was also confirmed in the present study.

The situation in the four authorities
In authority A in-service provision was mainly the task of advisory teachers with inspectors doing a limited amount. The involvement of inspectors tended to be in terms of management development and appraisal training. Advisory teachers were also involved in school-based in-service work and felt that this was very valuable. Courses were evaluated by using a standard form at the end of each training course but also by surveys to look at the effect of training on classroom practice. Headteachers were fairly critical of what was offered.

In authority B both advisers and advisory teachers were involved in in-service work. The main problem here was the authority's inability to provide as many courses as the headteachers and teacher wanted. The chief adviser spoke of receiving complaints from headteachers about their inability to get places on courses for their staffs. He reckoned that they were providing the equivalent of one course per term for every teacher. In-service provision was evaluated through the use of questionnaires. Headteachers spoke highly of the in-service provision offered.

In authority C courses were run by both advisers and advisory teachers. Advisory teachers spoke of many of their courses being over-subscribed and of the need to repeat them. They also supported school-based in-service work. Schools were having to pay for teachers to attend courses and were therefore thinking very carefully about provision and there was a move to school-based or cluster-based courses with schools organising what they wanted. Headteachers spoke of being 'more clear-sighted' about their in-service needs.

In authority D, in-service was the responsibility of the advisers with the advisory teachers, but there was some input from inspectors. Some advisers were devoting very high proportions of their time to this aspect of their work. One spoke of spending 70 to 80% of his time on in-service work. Others were spending less time than this. They were also heavily involved in school-based in-service work. Evaluation was by questionnaire but there was some fuller evaluation of some courses.
The questionnaire survey

The question explored in relation to in-service work was 'How do headteachers and teachers regard the provision for teacher development made by local authority advisory teams?'

Headteachers' views of the in-service provision offered by advisers and inspectors

Headteachers were asked 4 questions in relation to in-service work. For 2 of them they were asked to tick columns headed 'good service', 'average service', 'poor service' or 'service not used'. In the other 2 they were asked whether they agreed, were neutral or disagreed with certain statements. In both cases each tick in the columns was allocated 3 points, 2 points or one point. Those questions on the service received were given compensation for any answers where 'service not used' was ticked. The results of this are shown in the graphs on the next page and in the fold out table on page 220 which may be used in parallel with the information about the performance of the 4 authorities. The difference in the column headings accounts the difference of statement format below the graphs.

The average scores were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.32 for advisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.32 for inspectors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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F9  Provide effective in-service programmes
F10  Plan and organise competently
F11  Supporting and helping with staff development programmes
F12  Helping the school to develop its plan for appraisal
The scores were higher than those for advice and support. There was only one score below 2.00 and 6 above 2.50. Advisory teams were apparently seen by both headteachers and teachers as better at offering in-service education than providing advice and support.

Authority A had the highest score for 2 of the 4 items and the lowest score for none. Authority B had the lowest score for 3 items and the highest for none. Authority C had the highest score for one item and the lowest for none. Advisers and inspectors in authority D shared the highest score for one item and inspectors had one lowest score.

Authority A had good scores for 3 items and a satisfactory score for the third. The highest score was for ‘Planning and organising courses effectively’ (2.70) and the lowest score was for ‘Supporting and helping the school with staff development programmes’ (2.30).

Authority B had satisfactory scores for 3 of the 4 items of which the highest was ‘Planning and organising courses effectively’ (2.40). Their lowest score for ‘Supporting and helping with staff development programmes’ (1.95).

In authority C the highest score was ‘Planning and organising courses effectively’ (2.59) and the lowest was for ‘Helping the school to develop its plan for appraisal’ (2.26).

Authority D had its highest score for ‘Helping the school to develop its plan for appraisal’ (2.55) and this applied to both advisers and inspectors. The lowest scores for both groups were for ‘Supporting and helping with staff development programmes’ (2.13).

It is interesting to note that although authority A headteachers were critical of the in-service provision they had the highest average score and authority B where headteachers were more enthusiastic about provision had the lowest score.

For 3 of the 4 authorities ‘Supporting and helping with staff development programmes’ is the weakest area. ‘Providing effective in-service courses’ had good or satisfactory scores in all 4 authorities, as did ‘Planning and organising courses effectively’ and ‘Helping the school to develop its plan for appraisal.’

**Headteachers' views of in-service provision from advisory teachers**

Headteachers were asked only 3 questions in relation to advisory teachers and in-service provision and they were scored as before, with 2 of the questions referring to the level of service and one to agreement/disagreement. The results are shown in the graphs on the next page and in the fold out table. The difference in the column headings again accounts for the difference of statement format below the graphs. Those questions on the service received were given compensation for any answers where ‘service not used’ was ticked.

Average scores were as follows:

- Authority A 2.37
- Authority B 2.55
- Authority C 2.29
- Authority D 2.24
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A U T H O R I T Y  A

A U T H O R I T Y  B

A U T H O R I T Y  C

A U T H O R I T Y  D

F9 Provide effective in-service programmes
F10 Plan and organise competently
F11 Supporting and helping with staff development programmes
Authority B had the highest scores for every item in this section. Authority C had the lowest score for one item and authority D for 2 items. The performance of advisory teachers may account for the good reputation of in-service courses in authority B.

Authority A had satisfactory scores throughout of which the highest was 'Planning and organising courses effectively' (2.43). Authority B scored most highly on 'Provide effective in-service programmes' (2.68). Authority C scored best on 'Planning and and organising courses effectively' (2.52) and least well on 'Supporting and helping with staff development programmes' (2.12) This is interesting in that this authority scored the most highly on this where advisers were concerned. It suggests that advisory teachers were either less involved in school-based in-service work, which is unusual, or were less competent at it. Authority D had rather similar scores for 'Provide effective in-service programmes' (2.37) and 'Planning and organising courses effectively' (2.39) but 'Supporting and helping with staff development programmes' was considerably lower (1.96).

Teachers' views of in-service provision by advisers

Teachers were asked 10 questions about in-service provision by advisers. In 8 of these (F1-8) they were asked whether they agreed, were neutral or disagreed and in two (F9 and F10) they were asked whether they felt they were receiving good service, average service, poor service or had not used the service. In both cases the scoring was 3 points, 2 points or one point. Those questions on the service received were given compensation for any answers where 'service not used' was ticked. The difference in the column headings again accounts for the difference of statement format below the graphs.

All the scores were relatively high with only one score below 2.00. Average scores were:

- Authority A 2.40
- Authority B 2.35
- Authority C 2.32
- Authority D 2.35 for advisers,
  2.22 for inspectors

215
TEACHERS' VIEWS OF IN-SERVICE PROVISION FROM ADVISERS AND INSPECTORS

Fig. 10.3

AUTHORITY A

AUTHORITY B

AUTHORITY C

AUTHORITY D

Advisers

Inspectors

F1 Provide insights
F2 Make teachers think
F3 Use teachers' own experience in in-service work
F4 Provide usable ideas
F5 Create enthusiasm
F6 Stimulate teachers
F7 Work in appropriate ways for the task in hand
F8 Work in ways they are suggesting to teachers
F9 Providing effective in-service courses
F10 Planning and organising courses effectively
Authority A had the highest scores for 4 of the items with 4 scores in the good category and the rest satisfactory. They had the lowest scores for none. Authority B had the highest score for one item which was in the good category and the lowest score for ‘one. Authority C had the highest score for 2 items, one of which was good, and the lowest score for 2. Advisers in authority D had the highest score for 2 items, one in the good category and the lowest score for 2 and inspectors had the highest score for one item which was a good score and the lowest score for 7, one of which was below 2.00. Authority D’s inspectors were not expected to undertake in-service work to any extent so lower scores might be expected here.

Authority A had good or satisfactory scores throughout. The highest were for ‘Make teachers think’ (2.56) and ‘Provide usable ideas’ (2.56). The lowest score was for ‘Work in ways they are suggesting to teachers’ (2.17).

Authority B had a good score for ‘Use teachers’ own experience in in-service work’ (2.76). Authority B’s lowest score was for ‘Create enthusiasm’ (2.07).

Authority C had a good score for ‘Planning and organising courses competently’ (2.62). Their lowest score was for ‘Work in ways they are suggesting to teachers’ (2.00).

Authority D advisers and inspectors both had good scores for ‘Use teachers’ own experience in in-service work’ (2.55 and 2.54). The lowest score for advisers was ‘Planning and organising courses effectively’ (2.17). Inspectors’ highest score was for ‘Make teachers think’ (2.61). and the lowest was ‘Work in ways they are suggesting to teachers’ (1.96).

Authority A had 75% of good scores from headteachers and 40% from teachers. Authority B advisers did not do so well in the opinion of headteachers but had better opinions from teachers. Authority C had 1 good score from headteachers and 3 (30%) from teachers. Authority D had one good score from headteachers for both advisers and inspectors and one good score for advisers and 2 for inspectors from teachers. There were only two items which were common to both lists. These were ‘Providing effective in-service courses’ and ‘Planning and organising courses effectively’. Both had good or satisfactory scores throughout.

Teachers’ views of in-service provision by advisory teachers

Teachers were asked the same 10 questions about advisory teachers as they were asked about advisers. As before 2 questions required an opinion about the service received and 8 were statements with which teachers could agree, remain neutral or disagree. The difference in the column headings accounts for the difference in statement format. Those questions on the service received were given compensation for any answers where ‘service not used’ was ticked. Average scores were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority A</th>
<th>Authority B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Graph A" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Graph B" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority C</th>
<th>Authority D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Graph C" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Graph D" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F1  Provide insights
F2  Make teachers think
F3  Use teachers' own experience in in-service work
F4  Provide usable ideas
F5  Create enthusiasm
F6  Stimulate teachers
F7  Work in appropriate ways for the task in hand
F8  Work in ways they are suggesting to teachers
F9  Providing effective in-service courses
F10 Planning and organising courses effectively
F11 Supporting and helping with staff development programmes
F12 Helping the school to develop its plan for appraisal
Authority B did particularly well on this section with good scores for all items and had the highest score for all but one item for which authority A had the highest score. Authority C, by contrast, had the lowest score for every item although none of the scores was below 2.00 and 2 were good scores. Authorities A and D had good scores for 5 and 7 items respectively and satisfactory scores for the rest.

Authority A’s highest score was for ‘Provide usable ideas’ (2.76). There were also high scores for ‘Make teachers think’ (2.66), ‘Use teachers’ own experience in in-service work’ (2.66) and ‘Stimulate teachers’ (2.66). Their lowest score was for ‘Work in ways they are suggesting to teachers’ (2.32).

Authority B had very high scores for ‘Make teachers think’ (2.82) and ‘Provide usable ideas’ (2.87). Their lowest score was for ‘Planning and organising courses effectively’ (2.59) which is still a good score.

Authority C had good scores for ‘Make teachers think’ (2.54) and ‘Provide usable ideas’ (2.50) The lowest score was for ‘Planning and organising courses effectively’ (2.04).

Authority D had good scores for ‘Make teachers think’ (2.63), ‘Use teachers’ own experience in in-service work’ (2.60), ‘Provide usable ideas’ (2.60) and ‘Stimulate teachers’ (2.63). The lowest score was for ‘Planning and organising courses effectively’ (2.19).

All 4 authorities had good scores for ‘Make teachers think’ and ‘Provide usable ideas’. When the scores from headteachers and teachers for advisory teachers are compared there is something of a common pattern even though there are only 3 items in the headteachers’ questionnaire. In both, authority B has the highest scores for most of the questionnaire, all of which are good scores. With one exception, authority C has the least good scores from both.

The 2 questions which are common to all 4 questionnaires have good or satisfactory scores throughout. Authority A is at the top of the list in 3 of the 8 cases and authority B in 4. Authority B has the lowest score in one case. Authority C is at the top of the list in one case and has the lowest score in 4. Authority D has the lowest score in the other 3.

Headteachers have given advisers good scores in 25% of cases and teachers in 22%. Twenty five per cent of the headteachers’ scores for advisory teachers were good compared with 62% in the case of teachers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority / Advisers</th>
<th>sv</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F5</th>
<th>F6</th>
<th>F7</th>
<th>F8</th>
<th>F9</th>
<th>F10</th>
<th>F11</th>
<th>F12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D Advisers</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspectors</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores in this table are the average scores per item.

**Bold type**
The highest score for that item in the questionnaire.

**Italic**
The lowest score for that item in the questionnaire.

**Underlined** Scores of 2.50 or above

**Rectangle outline** Scores below 2.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority / Advisers</th>
<th>sv</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F5</th>
<th>F6</th>
<th>F7</th>
<th>F8</th>
<th>F9</th>
<th>F10</th>
<th>F11</th>
<th>F12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D Advisers</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspectors</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Authority A**

**Authority B**

**Authority C**

**Authority D**

**Advisers**

**Inspectors**

**F1** Provide insights

**F2** Make teachers think

**F3** Use teachers' own experience in in-service work

**F4** Provide suitable ideas

**F5** Create enthusiasm

**F6** Stimulate teachers

**F7** Work in appropriate ways for the task in hand

**F8** Work in ways they are suggesting to teachers

**F9** Providing effective in-service courses

**F10** Planning and organising courses effectively

**F11** Supporting and helping with staff development programmes

**F12** Helping the school to develop its plan for appraisal
Comments in questionnaires

Headteachers and teachers were given the opportunity to comment in the questionnaires and 19 of the comments made related to in-service provision.

There were 5 positive comments made about in-service provision. The following are examples:

I have only worked in the borough for 2 years but I have been struck by the number and variety of courses and by the friendliness and support given by advisory teachers.

*Primary school teacher, authority A*

Where in-service courses are run they are of a high standard.

*Primary school teacher, authority B*

I have found the in-service courses run by advisers stimulating and valuable when planning work in school.

*Primary school teacher, authority B*

There was only one negative comment:

Many courses offered do not have appropriate content for teachers in the early years.

*Nursery school teacher, authority D*

Three teachers made comments which were a mixture of positive and negative:

While I generally feel that courses are well thought out, sometimes those purporting to cover the needs of teachers from all phases are not particularly suited to the needs of the nursery school often being designed for a more formal timetable.

*Nursery school teacher, authority D*

Standard of INSET (in-service) courses is variable. Inevitably some advisers are better than others at establishing relationships with heads and teachers and they are therefore more effective.

*Primary school teachers, authority C*

Maths and music courses have been valuable. Special needs support service helpful. National Curriculum assessment course was very little help and extremely patronising.

*Primary school teacher, authority D*

Three comments were made about the methods used on courses:

Sometimes in in-service their own 'classroom' practice doesn't coincide with the ideals of the classroom.

*Primary school teacher, authority A*

Much concern that advisers rely too heavily on teachers' own experience. Many teachers feel bewildered at the current rate of change and are looking for a strong lead. If advisers rely on teachers' own experience, teachers feel 'let down', pointless attending the course etc.

*Primary school teachers, authority B*

Over emphasis on teachers helping themselves/each other on their courses.

*Primary school teacher, authority C*
There were 3 comments on course content:

I have attended a number of worthwhile courses but found it particularly helpful when advisers have brought in an ‘expert’ who has given practical demonstration, sometimes involving children. Equally a number of courses have been unhelpful. In one case documents which teachers had received prior to the course were simply read out. More recently I was among a group ranging from nursery to secondary teachers. This meant that the information given was either spread too thin or in some cases not appropriate. When attending a course I like to take away something practical to share with fellow staff. Sadly the provision of original, usable ideas has not always been the outcome.

*Primary school teacher, authority A*

Teachers’ time is precious - courses should be well planned and of value or it is just time wasted.

*Primary school teacher, authority B*

Course work has not been so effective. Perhaps this is because of the wide range of teacher experience and expertise on courses, which makes for problems of relevance of content. Could this be improved by more details published about courses, so that teachers are in a better position to make choices when making application for courses?

*Primary school teacher, authority B*

One teacher commented on timing:

I have found the courses I have attended very useful but twilight courses very difficult to attend and would take more advantage of what is on offer if it were at a more manageable time.

*Primary school teacher, authority A*

Another teacher commented on the effect of the financial limits on courses:

The financial restraints on schools to be able to use all of the courses staff would wish to attend does limit the effectiveness however well the courses are planned.

*Primary school teachers, authority D*

Evidence from interviews

Ninety eight points altogether were made about in-service provision in the course of the interviews. Forty four of these came from authority A, 17 from authority B, 13 from authority C and 24 from authority D.

Ten of the points made were positive statements about in-service provision in the authority. Three each came from authorities A, B and D and none from authority C. The following are examples:

- It seems to me a fairly reasonable spread of in-service at different levels for various staff. I mean, I feel it’s a fairly comprehensive provision.
  
  *Secondary school headteacher, authority A*

- On the whole I’m quite happy with the INSET I’ve been on and I think most of my staff haven’t come back and complained they’ve been on a poor one recently.
  
  *Primary school headteacher, authority B*
I think there’s clear evidence that there’s been an excellent programme this year. In some ways I think it’s improved every year. But it’s actually reactive and someone’s taken the trouble to look at things like the school development plans and to look at what issues are coming into schools and react to that very positively. I mean we actually heavily subsidise our INSET programme and the INSET budget which is given to us and I think that says enough, doesn’t it?

Secondary school headteacher, authority D

In 2 authorities, A and D, teachers and headteachers made some negative points. Three of these came from authority A and one from authority D.

We had an actual school closure and it was technology, ... Although we were involved with part of the agenda my staff came away feeling it was a complete waste of time. We were dissatisfied with the way the INSET day was conducted in that it was trying to achieve far too much and whereas part of the day the staff felt encouraged on technology, by the end of the day you felt utterly fazed and it had a knock on effect on my staff’s attitude to technology in this school.

Primary school headteacher, authority A

I get so frustrated and I know members of staff do when they do go on courses which are abysmal, because now they’re increasingly expensive. Our TGS (Training Grant Scheme) allocation is not generous and we’re a small school. We have difficulty providing supply cover if we have to go into that and do attend a course that’s not been well organised. They don’t present any new ideas.

Primary school headteacher, authority D

Five people made mixed points or points about the problems involved. Three of these came from authority A, 2 from authority B and one each from authorities C and D. The following are examples:

It’s quite difficult this in-service because schools are different (in their) styles of their development, aren’t they? At one school I’d need a particular input in certain areas. In another maybe ahead of that. If you’re looking at in-service across the authority to actually hit it right is virtually impossible, I would have said.

Primary headteacher, authority A

It’s patchy. It’s also patchy whether or not people get it. Some of it’s very good and some of it’s very poor. It may be that people going on the course and what they perceive the course to be about isn’t actually what they got when they arrived, so it may be their perception that is the trouble. Or the description doesn’t match what is actually given.

Primary school headteacher, authority B

There were 15 comments on content and method. Eight of these came from authority A, 3 from authority b and 2 each from authorities C and D. The following are examples:

The success of an in-service day depends on how you set your agenda and set the pace for that day and also how clear your objective is.

Primary school headteacher, authority A

There’s a whole generation of courses we should be talking about - courses on budgeting which we all went through on management of schools, courses on timetabling. These are the courses that staff identified after appraisal. Can’t be just senior management. Also curriculum courses.

Secondary school headteacher, authority B
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I think there's a general improvement, because I think (there is more) instruction in courses and greater input from advisory staff, ... but also, before this development, my staff were feeling that they were very much left on their own resources again. They were going on courses, taking up the time and arriving there to questions like 'Now what would you like to do?' or 'What do you think about such and such a thing?' so they were drawing from what they were doing rather than being given something and now I think they feel they are being supported and being given that help.

Primary school headteacher, authority B

In fact every single member of the humanities department who went to meetings has found them not useful. They felt they'd prepared nothing and expected the teachers to do all the work and then they'd circulate the results, but ... it didn't seem to us what we were wanting.

Secondary school headteacher, authority C

For our closure day in March we went to Bedford museum, all of us and the nursery nurse. It was a structured programme in the morning. We actually found out that there were Anglo-Saxons in our vicinity. We were all learning together so it puts us in a learning situation and handling artefacts and trying to guess, like the children ... I'll go in the red for that, because I think it's so valuable and it's the follow up and the coming back that we had the shared experience.

Primary school headteacher, authority D

There were some 50 comments about organisation. Some of these points were about the authority's organisation and came from advisers and advisory teachers. Chief advisers gave an outline of some aspects of what was happening in their authorities by way of in-service provision.

We have about 3000, 3500 hundred applications each term for LEA courses and we can usually accept about 2000, something like that. So that is about 6000, so that is one course a term for every teacher in the authority.

Chief adviser, authority B

INSET is tending to move to what schools are asking for. We are getting custom made courses.

Chief Adviser, authority C

From September all of, almost all the advisory service funds will be delegated to schools and they're now buying back our services in a variety of ways. The INSET portfolio is over-subscribed. Eighty seven per cent of the courses offered are running, many of them more than once, which is the highest we've ever had.

Principal adviser, authority D

Some advisers and advisory teachers spoke of their reactions to the changes which were happening:

We're left with sort of crystal ball gazing to try to gauge what's going to be needed perhaps fifteen months hence and I've found that very difficult. ... I'm still finding an element that needs to be responsive. ... We haven't left ourselves enough space to be responsive to those things that emerge were unforeseen at the time.

Inspector, authority A
And in a way in-service training has changed radically in the last 3 or 4 years - its purpose, the nature, the way it’s structured, why people participate in it. The National Curriculum has made us put a focus on it so in a sense the way that (we) are involved in in-service is influenced very much because part of (our) responsibility is to ensure that the National Curriculum is in place. So I think it’s inevitable that in-service will have to have changed and perhaps people’s attitudes as well because the relevance of the in-service. Sometimes it’s linked with outcomes from inspection and people see that that’s a relevant and significant link.

Inspector, authority A

The rationale on which I’ve been offering courses is very hit and miss. There’s no means of finding out, for me; there’s no body of information I can draw on to identify what schools’ top priorities might be.

Advisory teacher, authority C

Somebody asked me for a half a day workshop. They only want half a day on differentiation. Now that planning and research for that has taken all of half term week plus. I don’t know how much after that. Eight days it would cost them of my time for half a day so I think to be able to cost out a complete package in a realistic way.

Advisory teacher, authority A

Q How are school based things going. I mean, do you think that’s a good move. And how happy are you with the ones you’re doing that are school based?

M I’m doing the same stuff over and over again. They’re not asking for very exciting things. It’s really basic stuff like spelling and information retrieval which I think I’ve done about 20 times now.

D Well at least you get your hands on some of the staff rather than individuals coming to twilight sessions. We all know what happens. Nothing happens when they go back to school because nobody else was there.

K Actually that’s one of the things I have found myself for the first time doing school focused or departmental focused INSET is that I’m now realising that much of the work I had done with heads of department outside has not been cascaded back at all and we’re now identifying the problems in schools and being able to match INSET to those needs.

Advisory teachers, authority A

There was a good deal of evidence from headteachers and teachers that they were moving towards a situation where the individual school and groups of schools called the tune.

Nearly all our INSET now, we’re planning it and we’re delivering it. Help was requested and it’s not been very good but it’s at our initiative rather than the authority’s.

Secondary school headteacher, authority A

I like the way of us buying in what we want. I love the idea of being given the money and being able to decide. I know lot of it is DFE (Department for Education) money but instead of having it centrally based and we apply for it, it’s given out and we can decide how we want to use it. I think it’s great. The fact that we’re buying days of advisory staff instead of their having huge courses, we actually buy in their support more, which means we can choose which one we want for INSET which is vital to the school at the time and telling them what is happening in the school development plan.

Junior school headteacher, authority A

We’re all into appraisal - what happens at the end of appraisal to the teacher being appraised? We don’t have money there to reward colleagues. We can reward them by identifying courses put on by the advisory service. That’s why the in-service programme should be at the school end, consumer-led, rather than devised by the advisory service.

Secondary school headteacher, authority B
Increasingly with delegation, we’re doing more and more of our own in-service in school. And that’s interesting, that in-service is usually led by ourselves, not by somebody else. It’s felt that the expertise exists and what is required is time.

*Secondary school headteacher, authority B*

I am sad that we no longer have as many centrally organised courses. I’d temper that by saying that if there were a number now, I would not be able to afford them. ... I think there was some mileage to be had in joining together with staff from other schools, with teachers from other schools and sharing experiences and concerns and having a speaker, having discussion groups, on a subject you’d opted to go to.

*Primary school headteacher, authority C*

There were some expressions of concern about the cost of courses in the authorities that had already delegated the money to schools:

I’m just thinking about how teachers tend not to want to go to a course and if you’re looking at it in financial terms I think a day out would cost £140. It’s a lot of money to have in your hand to go and buy a bit more material to excite and stimulate the teachers in the classroom. It’s a lot of money.

*Primary school headteacher, authority C*

There was also some discussion about the value of twilight courses.

If you’ve had a hard day and you’re going to a meeting at half past four, if it goes on till six you don’t notice the time if what you’re getting is right and makes you excited.

*Primary school headteacher, authority C*

We’re still delivering twilight IT (information technology). People are still coming. Recently we ran just a 3 session twilight which was an introduction to a new type of computer aid for primary schools. ... We’re repeating it now and we’ll repeat it again after the holidays.

*Advisory teacher, authority A*

Questions were asked about evaluation in several of the interviews. There were 2 comments made in authority A, one in authority B, none in authority C and 5 in authority D.

We’ve undertaken inspections or surveys to look at the effect of training in the classroom in a very limited field and we’re doing a round on the Language in the National Curriculum Project. But inspectors do, as part of their programmes of inspection, try to identify what’s been dealt with in training and support as reflected in the classroom and it’s something they always look at in inspections.

*Chief inspector, authority A*

Nowadays there’s an evaluation, an evaluation sheet that the staff can fill in which allows staff to feel free to express - a recent case when staff attended the National Curriculum assessment which the borough now recognise and we as heads in the authority were most dissatisfied with. The fact that staff could feel free to write what they thought actually got the message through to the authority and it is now obvious in their planning for the next set of INSET on National Curriculum assessment.

*Primary school headteacher, authority A*

We’ve occasionally done it by overall questionnaire. We occasionally, about every two years, send out a questionnaire inviting comments, views in general terms. Members of the professional committee through the NAHT (National Association of Headteachers) are sending out a questionnaire at the moment to schools saying ‘What do you think about the authority’s INSET?’

*Chief adviser, authority B*
In the long term training we've been doing for the four plus initiative, we have linked our visits to the units. One of the things we actually specifically look for is evidence of the effectiveness of in-service in practice, in what we see on the walls, in the teachers' planning and that sort of thing. We're consciously looking for that and if it's not there then the question is why not. Was the delivery not good? Was the subject not right?'

Adviser, authority D

It's very difficult finding time for that sort of long term evaluation though. I've been trying since Christmas to get into the schools where we had a coordinator on the 20 day maths course in the last school year because we had some very, very positive feedback at the end of the course but I want to look now at their school twelve months on and I keep writing it into my diary and go to telephone some of these schools but because other things keep moving forward, it's getting knocked further and further back.

Adviser, authority D

Summary

Findings in relation to the question asked

1 Scores were higher for in-service education than those for advice and support where there were 50 scores below 2.00 (27%). In-service education had only 3 scores below 2.00 (2%). All the average scores except one were higher for in-service education than for advice and support.

2 There was not a great deal of difference between scores for any of the 4 groups of headteachers' and teachers' views of advisers and advisory teachers. Authority A had good or satisfactory scores throughout. Authority B had good scores for views of advisory teachers from both headteachers and teachers in every case but one and these were better than those for their views of advisers. Authority C had scored least well compared with other authorities on teachers' views of advisory teachers but all the scores were satisfactory. Authority D had better scores for advisers than inspectors as was to be expected but the scores for both were good or satisfactory except for one poor score from inspectors.

3 There were only two items which were common to all the questionnaires. The scores for these ranged from 2.09 to 2.70 and no group or authority stood out as being substantially different from the others. ‘Providing effective in-service courses’ had 4 scores of 2.50 or over and ‘Planning and organising courses effectively’ had 6 such scores.

4 ‘Provide insights’ had 2 good scores. ‘Make teachers think’ had 7 such scores as did ‘Use teachers’ own experience in in-service work’. ‘Provide usable ideas’ had 6 good
scores, ‘Create enthusiasm’ had 3, ‘Stimulate teachers’ had 3, ‘Work in appropriate ways for the task in hand’ had 2, ‘Work in ways they are suggesting to teachers’ had one, ‘Supporting and helping staff development programmes’ had none and ‘Helping the school to develop its plan for appraisal’ had 2.

*Other findings*

1 The views of headteachers and teachers stressed the growing importance of the involvement of schools in identifying their own in-service needs. Comments reflected a system in a state of change from a situation where courses were mainly something provided centrally free of charge to teachers who decided whether or not to go to them to one in which schools were more in charge of what was happening, provided a good deal of their own in-service training and had the money to decide what they wanted to buy by way of training for their staffs. Headteachers and teachers were generally happy with this change but concerned that the money was limited.

2 A number of the comments on the questionnaires and in the interviews suggested that teachers were looking for a lead from the advisory service and not always getting it. This is suggested by comments like ‘They don’t present any new ideas’ and ‘Over emphasis on teachers helping themselves/each other on courses.’

3 The range of evaluation techniques was limited. All 4 authorities used questionnaires to evaluate at the end of courses and there was some evidence from comments that this affected what happened. There were other techniques used, such as observing what had happened in classrooms, but this did not seem to be widespread.
11 EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY AND APPROACHES

Introduction

Advisers need to have a clear educational philosophy if they are to make judgements about educational practice. There is a problem about this, however, because they are often in the position of making judgements about the work of teachers whose philosophy differs from theirs and this means they have to be able to see from a different point of view.

Relevant literature

After the publication of the Education Reform Act in 1988, advisory teams in many authorities spent time defining their purpose and objectives. These were recorded in a variety of papers such as those produced by the 4 authorities in the present study. For example, Webster (1989, p.471), writing of the service in Tameside, spoke of identifying ‘a series of key functions of the advisory service’. Wilkins (1989) wrote of the partnership with schools which Nottinghamshire were developing as part of their inspection process. Advisory teams appeared to feel a need to state their overall philosophy and the kinds of approaches they would pursue.

Hardcastle (1988, p.205) wrote of mentorships in the States, a role somewhat similar to that of advisory teachers, looking at it from the point of view of those receiving mentoring. One such teacher spoke of the mentor’s ideals, ideas, commitment - ‘motivating me to think, re-evaluate everything’ and ‘his belief in other people - me’ which suggested that the philosophy of the mentor was important. The speaker also noted that the mentor had a direction.

Dean (1975b, p.12) wrote of the importance of the adviser having a thought out philosophy:

The first thing an LEA adviser needs is a personally thought out philosophy of education against which he (sic) can measure changes and developments. ...His philosophy must be more than a collection of prejudices; more than a collection of examples of good practice. He must have a clear idea of what the ends of education might be and be aware that there are many ways of achieving them. This involves a good deal of conscious effort on his part. He needs not only to get his basic thinking clear. He also needs to study and evaluate new developments in the light of it. Only then will he have a frame of reference against which to consider particular problems.

Beare et al (1989, p.100) stressed the importance of vision in a leader. Although this described headteachers it could also be applied to the work of advisers:
Outstanding leaders have a vision for their schools - a mental picture of a preferred future - which is shared with all in the school community and which shapes the programme for learning and teaching as well as policies, priorities, plans and procedures pervading the day-to-day life of the school.

Guthrie (1991, p.159) wrote of vision which he defined as ‘assisting all parts of an organisation in acquiring a sense of purpose.’ He suggested that effective leaders:

- Possess a vision of what the organisation with which they are connected could be like;
- Know how to motivate and inspire those with whom they work;
- Understand the major operational levers which can be employed to control or change an organisation’s course;
- Are intensely sensitive to and continually reflect upon the interaction of the external environmental conditions and internal organisational dynamics;
- Understand the fundamental components of strategic thinking that can be used to guide or alter an organisation;
- Comprehend the symbolic significance involved in representing their organisation to the outside world.

Learmouth (1989, p.20) suggested that people in education should ‘develop a far more clear and open system with people in non-professional groups.’ He believed that this involved ‘listening more closely to expressed needs, suggestions, anxieties, compliments or complaints’.

The situation in the four authorities
All 4 of the authorities had set out statements of their aims but there was only limited evidence that these had been shared with headteachers and teachers.

Authority A produced an annual statement of aims and objectives and success criteria. They had also produced policy statements on different aspects of their work including inspection. These were supported with a number of documents which were available to schools.

Authority B had a central statement which set out their aims and objectives and had been presented to the Education Committee and was open to public inspection. Headteachers demonstrated in discussion that they had seen this statement. This authority also had a very full computer programme recording advisers’ visit to schools. The arrangements for this had not been shared with headteachers and there was some suspicion about what was being recorded.

Authority C had statements about inspection which had been introduced as a new activity in 1991. These were statements to the Education Committee and open to the public.

Authority D had a very full statement about the role and function of their service supported by development plans and statements about inspection which were shared with the schools.
There was a tendency for these statements to refer to advisers and inspectors rather than advisory teachers. There were few statements about this group except in authority A where there had been a recent report which looked at how this part of the service might develop.

**The questionnaire survey**

This chapter addresses two questions:

1. How do headteachers and teachers view the educational philosophy and approaches of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers? Are they aware of the educational philosophy of these groups?
2. Is there a relationship between these views and those held of the work of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers in the key areas of inspection, advice and support and in-service education?

*Headteachers' views of the philosophy and approaches of advisers and inspectors*

Headteachers were asked 6 questions in relation to their views of the philosophy and approaches of advisers and inspectors. In each they were asked whether they agreed, were neutral or disagreed with statements about the advisory team in their authority. In some ways these were difficult questions to answer because headteachers had to deduce the thinking behind what advisers and inspectors said and did. The interesting thing is that in spite of this difficulty scores in this section were generally high. Twenty six (87%) of the 30 scores were above 2.50 and no score was below 2.00. Scores are shown in the graphs on the next page and the fold out table on page 240 which may be read in conjunction with the information about the performance of the 4 authorities.

Average scores were as follows:

- Authority A 2.84
- Authority B 2.80
- Authority C 2.64
- Authority D Advisers 2.48 Inspectors 2.51
HEADTEACHERS' VIEWS OF PHILOSOPHY AND APPROACHES FROM ADVISERS AND INSPECTORS

Fig. 11.1

A1 Have an overall vision of education
A2 Have clear objectives which are widely known
A3 Respect the views of teachers
A4 Have regard for the needs of schools
A5 Have concern for pupils' achievement
A6 Emphasise the centrality of pupils in the work of the school
Authority A had the highest average score, the highest scores for 3 of the 6 items and the lowest for none. All the scores from authority A were in the 'good' category. Authority B had the highest for one item and the lowest for none and again all the scores were in the 'good' category. Authority C had two of the highest scores and one of the lowest scores and all but one of the scores were good. Advisers in authority D had none of the highest and 4 of the lowest scores with 4 scores which were good. The inspectors in this authority had 2 of the lowest scores and none of the highest scores but 5 scores over 2.50.

Authorities A and B had high scores throughout. The highest score in authority A was for 'Have concern for pupils' achievement' which attracted a score of 2.93. Authority B had an even higher score for this item - 2.96.

Authority C had high scores for 'Respect the views of teachers' (2.83) and 'Have regard for the needs of schools' (2.86). Their lowest score was for 'Have clear objectives which are widely known' (2.17).

Authority D's advisers' highest score was for 'Emphasise the centrality of pupils in the work of the school' (2.66). Their lowest score was for 'Have clear objectives which are widely known' (2.08).

Inspectors in authority D had their highest score for 'Emphasise the centrality of pupils in the work of the school' (2.65) and their lowest score was 'Have clear objectives which are widely known' for which their score was (2.07). One might have expected the work of inspectors to appear clearer to headteachers and teachers than that of advisers.

Authorities A and B had good scores for the item 'Have clear objectives which are widely known' but authorities C and D had scores for this item which were near the bottom level of the 'satisfactory' category. All the scores for 'Have concern for pupils' achievement' were above 2.50.

Headteachers' views of the philosophy and approaches of advisory teachers
Headteachers were asked the same five questions about advisory teachers as they were asked about advisers and these were scored in the same way.

There was a high proportion of good scores with 19 of the 24 scores above 2.50 (79%). Only one score was below 2.00. The range of scores can be seen in the fold out table. Average scores were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HEADTEACHERS' VIEWS OF THE PHILOSOPHY AND APPROACHES OF ADVISORY TEACHERS

Fig. 11.2

A1 Have an overall vision of education
A2 Have clear objectives which are widely known
A3 Respect the views of teachers
A4 Have regard for the needs of schools
A5 Have concern for pupils' achievement
A6 Emphasise the centrality of pupils in the work of the school
Authority A had the highest score for 2 items and the lowest for one which was still a good score. Authority B had the highest score for 3 items and the lowest for one which again, was still a good score. Authority C the highest for one and the lowest for 3, one of which was below 2.00 and authority D had the highest for none and the lowest for 2.

Authority A had 4 good scores and the rest were satisfactory. Their highest scores were for ‘Respect the views of teachers’ (2.66), ‘Have concern for pupils’ achievement’ (2.75) and ‘Emphasise the centrality of pupils in the work of the school’ (2.66). The lowest score was for ‘Have clear objectives which are widely known’ (2.29). This item had a high score for advisers in this authority. The score for advisory teachers for ‘Have an overall vision of education’ was satisfactory but low compared with other scores in this section at 2.34.

Authority B had the good scores for 5 of the 6 results with their highest scores for ‘Respect the views of teachers’ (2.68), ‘Have regard for the needs of schools’ (2.72) and ‘Have concern for pupils’ achievement’ (2.72). Their lowest score was for ‘Have an overall vision of education’ (2.40) for which they had a high score for advisers.

Authority C had good scores for 4 items. Their highest score was for ‘Respect the views of teachers’ (2.76) and their lowest score for ‘Have clear objectives which are widely known’ (1.92). This was also comparatively low for advisers.

Authority D had 4 good scores of which the highest was for ‘Have concern for pupils’ achievement’ (2.70). Their lowest scores were for ‘Have an overall vision of education’ (2.27) and ‘Have clear objectives which are widely known’ (2.07).

All four authorities had scores below 2.50 for ‘Have an overall vision of education’. Three of the four authorities had scores below 2.50 for ‘Have clear objectives which are widely known’. The exception to this was authority B whose score for this item was 2.68. All four authorities had good scores for ‘Respect the views of teachers’, ‘Have regard for the needs of schools’, ‘Have concern for pupils’ achievement’ and ‘Emphasise the centrality of pupils in the work of the school.’

Teachers’ views of the philosophy and approaches of advisers and inspectors
Teachers were asked the same five questions as headteachers and these were scored in the same way. Results were lower than those for headteachers’ views of advisers with 20 of the 30 results above 2.50 (67% compared with 87%) and one below 2.00.

 Authorities A, B and C had the highest scores for 2 items each. Authorities A and B had none of the lowest scores but authority C had one, authority D advisers had 2 and inspectors in authority D had 3. The scores are shown on the graphs and the fold out table. Overall averages were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advisers</td>
<td></td>
<td>inspectors</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A1 Have an overall vision of education
A2 Have clear objectives which are widely known
A3 Respect the views of teachers
A4 Have regard for the needs of schools
A5 Have concern for pupils' achievement
A6 Emphasise the centrality of pupils in the work of the school
Authorities A and B had very even scores throughout with all scores above 2.50 in both authorities. The highest scores in authority A were for ‘Have an overall vision of education’ (2.73), ‘Have clear objectives which are widely known’ (2.73) and ‘Have concern for pupils’ achievement’ (2.70). The lowest score, which was still a good score was for ‘Respect the views of teachers’ (2.51).

In authority B the highest scores were for ‘Have concern for pupils’ achievement’ (2.79) and ‘Emphasise the centrality of pupils in the work of the school’ (2.79). The lowest score which was still a good one was for ‘Have an overall vision of education’ (2.55).

Authority C had very good scores for ‘Respect the views of teachers’ (2.79) and ‘Have regard for the needs of schools’ (2.83) but a poor score for ‘Have clear objectives which are widely known’ (1.92).

Authority D’s advisers had a good score for ‘Have concern for pupils' achievement’ (2.61) and a satisfactory but comparatively low score for ‘Have clear objectives which are widely known’ (2.03). Inspectors had good scores for ‘Have regard for the needs of schools’ (2.58) and ‘Have concern for pupils’ achievement’ (2.58) and, again, a satisfactory but comparatively low score for ‘Have clear objectives which are widely known’ (2.08).

**Teachers’ views of the philosophy and approaches of advisory teachers**

Teachers were asked the same 6 questions about advisory teachers as they were asked about advisers. Seventeen (71%) of the 24 scores were above 2.50 and one was below 2.00 which was not very different from the results for headteachers who had 79% of good scores for advisory teachers. Authority B had the highest scores for every item. Authority A had the lowest scores for 2 items, authority C for 3 items and authority D for one item. Scores can be seen in the graphs and the fold out table. Average scores were as follows:

- Authority A: 2.60
- Authority B: 2.81
- Authority C: 2.35
- Authority D: 2.54

---
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TEACHERS' VIEWS OF THE PHILOSOPHY AND APPROACHES OF ADVISORY TEACHERS

Fig. 11.4

A1 Have an overall vision of education
A2 Have clear objectives which are widely known
A3 Respect the views of teachers
A4 Have regard for the needs of schools
A5 Have concern for pupils' achievement
A6 Emphasise the centrality of pupils in the work of the school
Authorities A and B had fairly even scores throughout with the scores of authority B above those of A. Authority A had good scores for 4 of the 6 items and their highest scores were for ‘Respect the views of teachers’ (2.76) and ‘Have concern for pupils’ achievement’ (2.70). Their lowest score was for ‘Have clear objectives which are widely known’ (2.46).

Authority B had good scores for all items and very high scores for ‘Respect the views of teachers’ (2.91) and ‘Have concern for pupils’ achievement’ (2.96). Their lowest score was for ‘Have an overall vision of education’ (2.65) which was still a good score.

Authority C had 3 good scores and one poor score. Their highest score was for ‘Have concern for pupils’ achievement’ (2.73). They had a very low score for ‘Have clear objectives which are widely known’ (1.68).

Authority D had 4 good scores. Their highest score was for ‘Have concern for pupils’ achievement’ (2.77). Their lowest score was for ‘Have an overall vision of education’ (2.33).

Authority B has had good scores throughout this section of the study with no score below 2.50. Both authorities A and B have generally scored well on the items on ‘Have clear objectives which are widely known’ although authority A was comparatively low in the case of headteachers’ views of advisory teachers. Authorities C and D were weak in this area in almost every case except for authority D’s scores for teachers’ views of advisory teachers.

All 4 authorities scored well throughout on ‘Have concern for pupils’ achievement’ with no score below 2.50.

*Overall view of scores for philosophy and approaches*

Headteachers rate advisers above advisory teachers in all 4 authorities and give advisers a higher rating than do teachers. Eighty seven per cent of the scores from headteachers for advisers are at 2.50 or above compared with 63% of the scores of teachers. Both headteachers and teachers rate advisory teachers at 2.50 or above in 71% of the scores.

The item with the most variable scores is ‘Have clear objectives which are widely known.’ Here 6 of the scores (33%) are above 2.50 and 3 (18%) are below 2.00. The highest scoring item is ‘Have concern for pupils’ achievement’ where all the scores are above 2.50.

*Comparison of philosophy scores with those for the key area*

The philosophy scores in all cases are higher than those for the key areas. When the average philosophy scores are correlated with the average scores for the key area of inspection using Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation there is no evidence of a relationship (r = 0.1). Similarly with the key areas of advice and support (r = 0.06) and in-service education (r = 0.003). It must be concluded that effective practice in the key areas in the views of those on the receiving end is not related to headteachers’ and teachers’ idea of the educational philosophy held by advisers and advisory teachers.
## Table of Scores for Philosophy and Approaches

*Fig. 11.5*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority A</th>
<th>Authority B</th>
<th>Authority C</th>
<th>Authority D Advisers</th>
<th>Authority D Inspectors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AV</strong></td>
<td><strong>A1</strong></td>
<td><strong>A2</strong></td>
<td><strong>A3</strong></td>
<td><strong>A4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D Advisers</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D Inspectors</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D Advisers</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D Inspectors</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores in this table are the average scores per item.

**Bold type**
The highest score for that item in the questionnaire.

**Italic**
The lowest score for that item in the questionnaire.

**Underlined** Scores of 2.50 or above

**Surrounding rectangle** Scores below 2.00

1. Have an overall vision of education
2. Have clear objectives which are widely known
3. Respect the views of teachers
4. Have regard for the needs of schools
5. Have concern for pupils' achievement
6. Emphasise the centrality of pupils in the work of the school
Comments on questionnaires

The following were the only comments about philosophy and approaches made in the questionnaires:

The advice offered by most advisory teachers shows a depth of knowledge and thought. However, the financial and other constraints mean that the usual channel for disseminating this advice is through in-service training. Sometimes more informal visits to school, with chances for observation, discussion and advice in situ about concrete situations would be greatly valued.

*Primary school teacher, authority D*

I have generally found advisers and inspectors have not monitored or evaluated the good work achieved by the school but have tried to impose their own ideas and theories.

*Primary school teacher, authority D*

Curriculum development teachers (i.e. advisory teachers) are of value in a school because they work alongside the teacher and provide good support.

*Primary school teacher, authority B*

Evidence from interviews

There were 17 points made about philosophy and approaches in the interviews. Seven of these were made by headteachers, teachers and inspectors from authority A, 4 by headteachers and teachers from authority B and 3 each from authorities C and D.

The point which stands out most strongly is the dilemma mentioned at the beginning of this chapter i.e. that advisers and advisory teachers experience some difficulty in marrying their own philosophy with that of the schools and teachers they visit. An inspector in authority A spoke of:

This ability to put yourself into the position of the schools and the changing position and work out solutions with them which have a strong input of your beliefs and how to handle the situation so that they can take your advice and adapt to their needs.

*Inspector, authority A*

The schools visited in authority A included one deliberately chosen because inspection had been a problem. The teachers in this school expressed their views as follows:

I think their preconceived philosophy shone through the whole time in that they had their very strong opinions and there was an intolerance coming through all the time.

*Junior school teacher, authority A*

It seemed to us that at the bottom of it was a difference in philosophy which we hadn’t really been prepared to face. We’d been prepared for advice and criticism on the way we were teaching and the content and whatever, but not on the fact that maybe at the bottom of it all we were just not going in the same direction.
B I think that's an important point. I think it's a dichotomy of philosophy and I think I'm right in thinking that it is a good school because it does produce good results because we have parents who get their children in and we have a waiting list and so on and high local esteem. It was almost as if the inspectors wanted to sort of put us down because we were in fact succeeding but not necessarily perhaps approaching things in what might be termed the doctrine and I don't feel that one should have any particular doctrine forced on one. Education should be more liberal and that people should be able to teach in the way in which they can best achieve results and in which children are actually learning.

C The conversation we had with one of the inspectors the very last day in that she decided what comments and again we disagreed and she took umbrage on several occasions and got quite aggressive because of her preconceived philosophy of education. In our view she was not open, not open to what we thought.

A similar view was expressed by a secondary headteacher:

"There’ve been one or 2 occasions when the views of an advisory teacher about a particular subject are diametrically opposed to my own and SMT (Senior Management Team) on something and ... I do object when they push a view in a sort of back door way as well. That happened only once but if you’ve got a certain view about something I don’t think you’ve got some sort of missionary zeal to convert your staff.

Secondary school headteacher, authority A

The problem was expressed rather more sympathetically by other teachers:

They need to appreciate that every school is individual. I think another thing that is tied up in a way with knowing the school, that they don’t come in with pre-conceived, tight ideas of how particular things should be done, that they can recognise that there are a variety of ways of doing something and not come in to preach their own ideas and their own philosophy.

Primary school headteacher, authority C

You know, someone will go into a room and see 15 or 16 youngsters playing with computers. Someone else will go into the same room, see the same thing happening and realise the expertise and understanding and the work that is going on in that particular area. And sometimes people come with all sorts of different views. ‘This is a class - they’re all sitting in rows - they’re all quiet. Oh dear, we don’t want that’ Or others who’ll come in and say, ‘What’s going on. It’s bedlam. They’re crawling all over the place. We don’t want that.’ And thinking there’s an agreement between the adviser and the staff of the school about what is going on then the quality of the relationship, the quality of the development is far better, which is nice. I like to see that. That’s beginning to happen, isn’t it?

Secondary school headteacher, authority B

At the same time there was evidence that people wanted an advisory team which had a strong philosophy and appreciated it when advisers succeeded in marrying their own views with those of the school:

Someone who is quite clear in their philosophy in terms of education. Somebody who comes in with clear cut views of education in terms of not being very theoretical with airy fairy textbook ideas but someone also who may not necessarily be in parallel with the headteacher’s and the school’s philosophy and understanding of education but is prepared to listen but has their own clear cut ideas as well, someone who isn’t into beating about the bush and delivering airy fairy ideas but can be supportive and listen and guide you and the school. They have their view and you have your view and the 2 can work together without clashing.

Primary school headteacher, authority A
I think from my experience, certainly somebody with very, very good sort of map, that's got the right phrases, sort of personal relationship skills and is a very, very good judge of how to handle people, including heads ... including staff who may be feeling threatened or whatever their feelings. We want somebody there who's got very, very good skills and I probably include counselling skills also as well, because this does happen as well. I think it's very good if staff have somebody they feel they can turn to if they feel there's a crisis in their own career or something. And then, ... somebody who has a very strong reputation in primary education and it's strong because they have been successful. They are experienced enough to understand primary schools and yet can have firm ideas.

*Primary school headteacher, authority C*

If we look at the inspection/advisory team, there are certain people that have got their act together. They have a very strong vision, maybe the wrong one, but at least they've got strong vision and they can communicate it.

*Secondary school headteacher, authority D*

Whether or not they agree with what they see going on, at least at the end of the time the staff feel that they valued what they saw that was good and that perhaps they can see value in some things that aren't all the rage at the moment and are prepared to listen to why the teacher values that particular aspect.

*Primary school headteacher, authority A*

Certainly (the science adviser) understood some of the underpinning, philosophical underpinning and moral underpinning of the National Curriculum ... There is this entitlement that didn't matter what school you went to, what colour you were, what money your parents were bringing in, what's your religion, you were entitled to access to a similar curriculum of similar quality.

*Secondary school headteacher, Authority D*

Headteachers were critical when they felt advisers did not have a clear idea of where they were going and a strong philosophy:

There are very few advisers in my experience who've actually got grasp of educational issues. There are still a lot who are very good on individual subjects and there are one or two that in the past have been of value on all subjects ... Occasionally they're quite literate dogsbodies, to help out on a particular curriculum issue, but they don't seem to have any grasp at all of general educational issues. They're purblind and just see their own particular area and aren't interested in being general advisers.

*Secondary school headteacher, authority C*

When you have a group of people ... doing the same job on behalf of the local authority but with distinctly different messages to the schools and in some cases the school got different advice from 2 different people - now they really should have got their communications acts together and agreed what they were going to be saying.

*Secondary school headteachers, authority D*

'Many teachers feel that visits by advisers that are clearly outlined with positive target-setting would be more beneficial than the rather 'vague' general visits made in the past.

*Primary school headteacher, authority B*

This problem may be alleviated to some extent as schools start to buy in advice when they will presumably aim to buy from those sympathetic to their own point of view. There will be pressure on advisers to work sympathetically even when they disagree with what they find in schools because of the need to maintain employment. This will also be something of a
dilemma for inspectors also. This was clearly expressed in an article by Sergiovanni (1984, p.357) who wrote of supervision and evaluation of teaching in the United States. He suggested that there was a tendency to reductionism in breaking down teaching into its component parts without giving enough attention to the involvement of teacher and supervisor and the natural bias of the supervisor. However supervision is planned the supervisor will bring to it his or her own baggage of experience and philosophy which will make some things of greater importance than others. Supervision is more likely to be successful in developing the work of teachers where supervisor and teacher reflect together on the teaching observed and where the whole question of bias is understood and allowed for. ‘The reality that counts in supervision and evaluation is that which individuals perceive.’

There were several comments supporting the view that the advisory teacher was most effective working alongside the teacher in the classroom.

I would like advisory teachers to spend longer in the classroom working alongside the classroom teacher so I would learn from observation and first hand experience.

*Primary school teacher, authority A*

Curriculum development teachers are of value in a school because they work alongside the teacher and provide good support.

*Primary school teacher, authority B*

My experience with an advisory teacher was refreshing and stimulating. Her approach was sympathetic and extremely helpful. I just wish the service was more regular.

*Primary school teacher, authority B*

In view of this kind of comment it is disturbing that the national survey suggests that advisory teachers are disappearing even faster than advisers.

**Summary**

*Findings in relation to the questions asked*

1 Headteachers and teachers appeared to be well aware of the educational philosophy of their advisory teams and were generally approving of it, demonstrating this in high scores for this section. However, advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers experienced a dilemma in marrying their own educational philosophy with that of the schools and teachers they visited. Schools expected them to have a clear views but did not want these views imposed where they differed from the school’s or teachers’ views.

2 When the educational philosophy averages are compared with those for the key areas of inspection, advice and support and in-service education they are higher in every case. However, there does not appear to be any relationship between headteachers’ and
teachers' views of the work of advisers and advisory teachers in the key areas and their views of their educational philosophy and approaches.

Other findings

1 This section of the study has produced 4 sets of average scores. Authority A had the highest average score for headteachers' views of advisers' philosophy. Authority B had the highest score for headteachers' views of advisory teachers' philosophy and for teachers' views of the philosophy of advisers and advisory teachers.

2 Authorities A and B also differed from C and D in each having good scores for 'Have an overall vision of education' in all but one case. They also had higher scores than authorities C and D for 'Have clear objectives which are widely known.' This suggests that there may be some connection between having an overall vision and clear objectives and doing well in other areas.

3 All 4 authorities scored well on 'Have concern for pupils' achievement' with no score below 2.50. There were generally good scores for 'Respect the views of teachers', 'Have regard for the needs of schools' and 'Emphasise the centrality of pupils in the work of the school.'

4 Headteachers rated the educational philosophy and approaches of advisers more highly than did teachers and more highly than they rated those of advisory teachers in all 4 authorities. Teachers rated the educational philosophy and approaches of advisory teachers more highly than those of advisers in 2 of the 4 authorities.

5 Advisory teachers were valued for the work they did in the school situation.
12 KNOWLEDGE, SKILL AND EXPERIENCE

Introduction

An essential concomitant of effective advisory work is the experience and knowledge an adviser or advisory teacher brings to the work. If advisers and advisory teachers are to be able to advise teachers they must have suitable experience, knowledge and skill on which they can draw. We have already noted a number of critical comments from headteachers and teachers about advisers with secondary experience advising in primary schools (cf. pp.166, 172, 173, 200, 203) and approving comments about the background experience of advisory teachers. (cf. pp.244, 245)

Relevant literature

In 1978 Bolam et al found that 42% of his respondents had some form of degree which was a higher proportion than for teachers at that time. Twenty three per cent had been headteachers and 28% heads of department. Fourteen per cent had taught full time in a college of education. Stillman and Grant (1989) studying the service a decade later found only 14.4% had been headteachers but another 6.9% had been senior managers in schools and 17.8% had been middle managers. Ten point nine per cent had taught in further or higher education. The vast majority of advisers in Bolam’s study were between 31 and 60 years of age with 41% between 41 and 50. The ages of advisers had changed little by the time Stillman and Grant made their survey. They found the average age for all advisers was 47 years.

Stillman and Grant also found a change in the spread of subject specialisms since Bolam’s survey, when advisers in physical education, music and home economics were numerically greater than those for other subjects. By 1986/7 when this study was carried out, the core subjects of English, mathematics and science were well represented and there was a fair range of other subjects including a number of cross curricular areas such as environmental studies and equal opportunities.

Margerison (1978), who wrote about advisory work in industry, stressed that advisers must be good at observation, have technical credibility in knowing what questions to ask and how to get the data.

Harland (1990, p.42,43) noted that:

The advisory teacher was admired for his(sic) ability to identify quickly the needs of children, for his contribution in extending teacher awareness of suitable programmes and for his positive skills when working with pupils around the computer.
Hardcastle (1988, pp. 205, 206) wrote of mentorship in North America and quoted from teachers who had experienced working with a mentor who appeared to be in the same sort of role as an advisory teacher in some situations. A teacher spoke of the mentor being 'very perceptive, right on top of the situation, extra smart' and again of 'his intellectual drive, capacity, determination, the way he works'.

Dean (1975b, p. 12) wrote of the skills needed by advisers. She suggested that they needed to be expert at observing teachers and able to match advice to teaching style. Good advisers were able to distinguish teacher directed work from work which was genuinely the pupils’ own. They were able to assess children’s work and read school and classroom atmosphere. They could be persuasive but were also able to help teachers to build on their own thinking. They were skilled discussion leaders, ‘knowing how to make people feel at ease, how to invite, welcome and use contributions’. They could also draw the contributions together and sum up, helping the group to arrive at conclusions.

The situation in the 4 authorities
Three of the 4 authorities, B, C and D were large enough to have specialist advisers in all the main subjects of the National Curriculum and some others as well. The fourth authority, authority A, had a team of only 9 inspectors, of whom 3 were primary specialists and one a secondary specialist, leaving only 5 people, or 6 if the secondary specialist is included, to cover advice on the whole of the National Curriculum and its accompanying themes and dimensions. This created problems in inspection and advisory teachers, reporting to inspectors, were used as advisers to make good the gaps in provision. This is a problem which is likely to increase if local government moves to a situation where a larger number of small authorities are responsible for education.

Authority D had a rather different problem because the split into an inspectorate and an advisory service created a situation in which at least two people were needed for each subject area, one being an inspector and the other an adviser. This had not proved possible to do in all areas of curriculum and there were 3 people with both adviser and inspector roles.

All 4 authorities suffered from the fact that when vacancies occurred it was often not possible to fill them because of the current financial situation. This gave uneven coverage of some areas of work.

The questionnaire to inspectors asked for information about background. In authority A all the team returned the questionnaire. This showed that of the three men and six women who formed the inspectorate, four had been in post for fewer than 5 years, four for between 5 and 10 years and one for 17 years. All but one had either a teacher’s certificate or a post graduate certificate of education. Seven had first degrees, 4 had advanced diplomas and 5 had higher degrees.
Six members of the team were between 46 and 55 years of age and 3 were 56 or over. Four came to the inspectorate from headteachers' posts, one from a head of department post, 3 had been in senior management posts and one in higher education.

There were 17 advisory teachers in authority A, 7 men and 10 women. Eleven of them had been in post less than 5 years and 6 for more than 5 years. Fourteen had either a teachers' certificate or a post graduate certificate in education. Ten had first degrees, 7 had advanced diplomas, 7 had higher degrees and 3 were studying for masters' degrees. One was under 35 years of age, 9 were between 36 and 45 years and 6 between 46 and 55 (one did not complete this section).

Four came to their present posts from classroom teacher posts, 7 had been heads of department, one had been head of faculty, 2 had been deputy heads of primary schools, 2 had been deputy heads of secondary schools and one a lecturer in further education.

In authority B the team consisted of 21 advisers, of whom 11 replied to the questionnaire survey. Eleven team members were male and 10 female. All the senior members of the team were male. There were specialists in all the major subjects of the curriculum except craft, design and technology, where the post was vacant. Of the 7 men and 4 women who replied to the questionnaire, 7 had been in post for less than 5 years, one for between 6 and 10 years, one for between 11 and 15 years and 2 for more than 16 years. All had qualifications in teaching, 8 had first degrees, 3 of these also had higher degrees and 3 also had advanced diplomas. Four were between 36 and 45 years of age, and the rest between 46 and 55 years. Four had been heads of department in secondary schools before coming into their present posts. One had been head of a secondary school and 3 had been heads of primary schools. Two came from teacher training establishments and one was a senior lecturer.

Only 4 of the 18 advisory teachers replied to the questionnaire. These were all female. Three had been in post for fewer than 5 years and one for between 6 and 10 years. Two had teacher qualifications, all had first degrees and one had a higher degree and another an advanced diploma. One was 35 years of age, one between 36 and 45, one between 46 and 55 and one over 56. Two had been deputy heads of primary schools, one a classroom teacher and one had worked in a museum before coming into the present post.

Authority C had a team of 45 advisers of whom 31 returned the questionnaires. Of these 31 advisers, 21 were male and 10 female. In the team as a whole there were 16 women and 29 men. All the major curriculum specialisms were represented.

Twenty eight of those who replied had a teacher's certificate or PGCE (Post Graduate Certificate in Education) and a similar number had a degree. Twenty five had both. Nine had an advanced diploma and 19 had a higher degree. Seventeen of those who replied had been in the advisory service for fewer than 5 years, 5 had been advisers for between 6 and 10 years,
3 had 11 - 15 years service as advisers and 2 had been in the service for between 20 and 25 years. Four people did not reply to this section.

Fourteen members of the team were aged between 36 and 45 years, 13 were aged between 46 and 55 years and 4 were 56 years or over. Seven of those who replied had been headteachers, one had been a deputy head teacher, 8 had been class teachers, 2 had been teacher trainers and 11 had held a variety of other senior posts in education. Two people did not reply to this section.

Twenty six of the 48 advisory teachers returned the questionnaires. Of these 8 were male and 18 female. In the team as a whole 27 were female and 21 male. Two were between 25 and 35 years of age, 13 were between 36 and 45 years, 7 were between 46 and 55 years and 2 were over 55 years. Two respondents did not reply to this section. Sixteen of those who replied had been fewer than 5 years in an advisory teacher role; 5 had been advisory teachers for 6 to 10 years and 2 had been advisory teachers for 11 - 15 years. Three people did not reply to this section.

Seventeen of those who replied to this section had a teachers' certificate or PGCE (a number of those in these posts were appointed for special background experience such as work in industry and were therefore less likely than advisers to be qualified as teachers) Fifteen had a degree and 9 had both a teaching qualification and a degree. Six had an advanced diploma and 7 had a higher degree. Eight of the advisory teachers replying had been heads of department; 6 had been class teachers and 5 had held various other posts. Seven did not reply to this section.

In authority D where the team was divided into inspectors and advisers there were 17 inspectors altogether and 17 advisers including the two principal advisers, two senior inspectors and three senior advisers. Twelve of the inspectors were male and 5 were female. Nine of the advisers were male and 8 were female. There were inspectors for all the subjects of the National Curriculum except physical education and languages where an adviser had to double for both roles. There was an inspector but no adviser for English and concern about this was expressed by various groups of teachers and headteachers.

Fourteen inspectors and 10 advisers replied to the questionnaire. Five had been in advisory work between 0 and 5 years, 7 between 6 and 10 years and one between 16 and 20 years. Eleven did not reply to this section. Among the inspectors 5 were between the ages of 36 and 45 years and 9 were between the ages of 46 and 55 years. All but one had a teachers' certificate or PGCE and 12 had a degree, 4 had an advanced diploma and 7 had higher degrees. One person did not reply to this section. Eight had been headteachers in their previous posts, 2 had been heads of department and 2 had had other responsibilities. Two did not reply to this section.
Among the advisers, one was aged between 36 and 45 years, 6 were aged between 46 and 55 years and one was aged between 56 and 65 years. Two people did not reply to this section. Seven had teachers’ certificates or PGCEs, 5 had degrees, 1 had an advanced diploma and 2 had higher degrees. Six had worked as advisers for between 0 and 5 years, 1 had been an adviser for between 16 and 20 years and one had been in advisory work for between 26 and 30 years. Two did not reply to this section. One had been a headteacher, one a deputy head, 2 had been heads of department, one a classroom teacher and three had held various other posts. Two did not reply to this section.

It is interesting to note that in this authority the male/female balance was better for advisers than for inspectors. The inspectors were also better qualified than the advisers.

Only 6 advisory teachers out of 52 replied to the questionnaire in spite of a reminder being sent. Of these 2 were male and 4 were female. In the team as a whole 23 were female and 29 were male. Three were between 36 and 45 years of age and 3 between 46 and 55 years. Four had teachers’ certificates or PGCEs and four had degrees. Two had both. Four had advanced diplomas and 3 had higher degrees. Five had been advisory teachers for 0 to 5 years and one had held such a post for between 6 and 10 years. One had been a deputy head before coming into the present post, one had been a head of year, one a class teacher and one an advisory teacher. Two did not reply to this section.

These figures suggest that in all 4 authorities, advisers and inspectors are well qualified for their work, both academically and in terms of previous employment. The proportion who had first degrees (82%) compares interestingly with the 42% found by Bolam in the 1970s and probably reflects the increase in graduates in the teaching profession. Forty eight per cent also had higher degrees.

The range of previous posts is also interesting. Twenty four (45%) had held headships of primary or secondary schools compared with 23% in Bolam’s study. Five (10%) had been deputy heads or held other senior management posts. Nine (17%) had been heads of department and nine (17%) classroom teachers and 6 (11%) had been involved in teacher training. There was also a range of other posts which included some administrative posts and some involved with local or national projects.

In 3 of the 4 authorities there were more men than women in advisers’ and inspectors’ posts. Overall 59% of the advisers and inspectors were male and 41% female.

The questionnaire survey

This chapter addresses two questions:

- How do headteachers and teachers view the knowledge, skill and experience of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers?
Is there a relationship between these views and those held of the work of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers in the key areas of inspection, advice and support and teacher development?

*Headteachers' views of the knowledge, skill and experience of advisers and inspectors*

Headteachers were given 6 statements about the advisory service in their authority and asked to say whether they agreed, were neutral or disagreed. Statements marked 'agreed' were allocated 3 points, those marked 'neutral' 2 points and those marked 'disagreed' one point.

Scores were generally high and 24 scores out of 30 (80%) were at 2.50 or above. There were no scores below 2.00. The fold out table on page 260 may be read in conjunction with the information about each authority’s performance. Average scores were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.47 for advisers 2.37 for inspectors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HEADTEACHERS' VIEWS OF THE KNOWLEDGE, SKILL AND EXPERIENCE OF ADVISERS AND INSPECTORS
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B1  Have personal credibility
B2  Have good general knowledge of education
B3  Have specialist skills
B4  Have professional expertise
B5  Do work of high quality
B6  Are enthusiastic and stimulating
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Authority A had good scores throughout and had the highest scores for all but one item. Authority B also had scores above 2.50 throughout but had neither the highest or the lowest score for any item. Authority C’s scores were all good and they had the highest score for one item and the lowest score for none. Authority D advisers had 3 scores above 2.50 and the lowest score for 3 items. Authority D inspectors also had 3 good scores and the lowest scores for 3 items.

The highest score from authority A was for ‘Have professional expertise’ (2.93). There was also a high score for ‘Have specialist skills’ (2.85). Their lowest score which was still a very good score was for ‘Do work of high quality’ (2.73).

Authority B’s highest scores were for ‘Have professional expertise’ (2.76) and ‘Do work of high quality’ (2.76). Their lowest scores were for ‘Have personal credibility’ (2.52) and ‘Are enthusiastic and stimulating’ (2.52).

The highest score from authority C was for ‘Do work of high quality’ (2.79) and their lowest score was for ‘Have good general knowledge of education’ (2.52).

Authority D advisers had their highest scores for ‘Have specialist skills’ (2.60) and ‘Have professional expertise’ (2.60) Their lowest score was for ‘Have good general knowledge of education’ (2.26). The inspectors in this authority had their highest score for ‘Have professional expertise’ (2.67) and their lowest score for ‘Are enthusiastic and stimulating’ (2.15).

All 4 authorities had scores above 2.50 for ‘Have professional expertise’ and scores were also high for ‘Have specialist skills’. No item had a poor score.

Headteachers’ views of the knowledge, skill and experience of advisory teachers
Headteachers were given the same statements for advisory teachers as for advisers and inspectors and asked to react in the same way. Scoring was also similar. Scores were slightly lower than those for advisers and inspectors with 17 (71%) scores at 2.50 or above. They can be seen in summary on the fold out table. There were no scores below 2.00. The average scores were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HEADTEACHERS' VIEWS OF THE KNOWLEDGE, SKILL AND EXPERIENCE OF ADVISORY TEACHERS
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Authority A had 4 scores above 2.50 and had the highest score for one item and the lowest for one. Authority B had all good scores and had the highest score for 4 items and the lowest for none. Four of authority C's scores were above 2.50 and they had the highest score for 2 items, sharing this with authority B for one of scores. They had the lowest score for one item. Authority D had 3 good scores, the highest score for none and the lowest score for 4.

Authority A had a very high score for 'Have specialist skills (2.91). Their lowest score was 'Have personal credibility' (2.32).

Authority B had high scores for ‘Have professional expertise’ (2.80), ‘Do work of high quality’ (2.80) and ‘Are enthusiastic and stimulating’ (2.84). Their lowest score was also for ‘Have personal credibility ’ (2.52).

Authority C's highest scores were for ‘Have specialist skills’ (2.80), ‘Have professional expertise’ (2.80) and ‘Do work of high quality’ (2.84). Their lowest score was for ‘Have good general knowledge of education’ (2.16).

The highest score for authority D was for ‘Have specialist skills (2.70) and the lowest score was for ‘Have good general knowledge of education’ (2.24).

Scores were above 2.50 in all 4 authorities for 3 items - 'Have specialist skills', 'Have professional expertise' and 'Do work of high quality'. The items which scored least well with only authority B scoring above 2.50 were 'Have personal credibility' and 'Have good general knowledge of education'.

Teachers' views of the knowledge, skill and experience of advisers and inspectors
Teachers were asked to grade the same statements as headteachers and these were scored in the same way. Scores were fairly high but not as high as those from headteachers. Fifteen (50%) of the 30 scores above 2.50 compared with 80% in the views of headteachers and no score was below 2.00. They are summarised on the fold out table. Average scores were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.49 for advisers 2.47 for inspectors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TEACHERS' VIEWS OF THE KNOWLEDGE, SKILL AND EXPERIENCE OF ADVISERS AND INSPECTORS
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>B5</th>
<th>B6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B1 Have personal credibility
B2 Have good general knowledge of education
B3 Have specialist skills
B4 Have professional expertise
B5 Do work of high quality
B6 Are enthusiastic and stimulating
Authority A had the highest score for 5 of the six items and the lowest score for none. Five items were also above 2.50. Authority B had the highest score for one item and the lowest score for one with 3 scores above 2.50. Authority C had the lowest score for 4 items and the highest score for none, but 2 of the scores were above 2.50. Authority D advisers had neither the highest nor the lowest score for any item but had 2 items above 2.50. Inspectors had the lowest score for one item and 3 items with scores above 2.50.

Authority A had good scores for 'Have good general knowledge of education' (2.78), 'Have specialist skills' (2.78) and 'Have professional expertise'. Their lowest score was for 'Are enthusiastic and stimulating' (2.39).

Authority B had a very good score for 'Have specialist skills' (2.90). Their lowest score was also for 'Are enthusiastic and stimulating' (2.21).

Authority C's highest scores were for 'Have specialist skills' (2.67) and 'Have professional expertise' (2.62). Their lowest score was for 'Do work of high quality' (2.21).

Authority D advisers scored well for 'Have specialist skills' (2.74) and 'Have professional expertise' (2.68) with their lowest score for 'Are enthusiastic and stimulating' (2.32) which was also the lowest scoring item for authority D's inspectors (2.27). The inspectors' highest scores were for 'Have good general knowledge of education' (2.61) and 'Have professional expertise' (2.65).

Two items 'Have specialist skills' and 'Have professional expertise' had scores above 2.50 from all 4 authorities. One item 'Are enthusiastic and stimulating' had no score above 2.50. 'Have personal credibility' and 'Do work of high quality' had good scores from authority A only.

Teachers' views of the knowledge, skill and experience of advisory teachers

Teachers were asked to grade the same 6 statements for advisory teachers as for advisers and these were dealt with in a similar way. Nineteen of the 24 items attracted a score of above 2.50 (79%). This is higher than the teachers' scores for advisers or headteachers' scores for advisers or advisory teachers. There were no scores below 2.00. The scores are summarised in the graphs and on the fold out sheet. Average scores were as follows:

Authority A 2.74
Authority B 2.85
Authority C 2.48
Authority D 2.62
TEACHERS' VIEWS OF THE KNOWLEDGE, SKILL AND EXPERIENCE OF ADVISORY TEACHERS
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AUTHORITY A

AUTHORITY B

AUTHORITY C

AUTHORITY D

B1 Have personal credibility
B2 Have good general knowledge of education
B3 Have specialist skills
B4 Have professional expertise
B5 Do work of high quality
B6 Are enthusiastic and stimulating
Authorities A and B had all their scores above 2.50. Authority A had the highest score for one item and authority B for the remaining 5. Neither had any of the lowest scores. Authority C had the lowest scores for 5 of the 6 items and authority D for the remaining one. Authority C had 3 scores above 2.50 and authority D had 4.

Authority A had high scores for ‘Have specialist skills’ (2.78), ‘Have professional expertise’ (2.80) and ‘Do work of high quality’ (2.80). Their lowest score was for ‘Have good general knowledge of education’ (2.66).

Authority B had high scores throughout except for ‘Have good general knowledge of education’ (2.65) which was still a good score. Their highest scores were for ‘Have specialist skills’ (2.96), ‘Have professional expertise’ (2.91) and ‘Do work of high quality’ (2.91).

The highest score for authority C was for ‘Have professional expertise’ (2.73) and the lowest score was for ‘Have good general knowledge of education’ (2.14).

Authority D had high scores for ‘Have specialist skills’ (2.83) and ‘Have professional expertise’ (2.80). Their lowest score was for ‘Have personal credibility’ (2.43).

Three items had scores of above 2.50 from all 4 authorities. These were ‘Have specialist skills’, ‘Have professional expertise’ and ‘Do work of high quality’. No item had particularly low scores.

**Overall view of scores for knowledge, skill and experience**

Two items in this list had good scores from every group. These were ‘Have professional expertise.’ and ‘Have specialist skills.’ ‘Have personal credibility’ had 7 scores of the 18 above 2.50. ‘Have good general knowledge of education’ had 10 such scores and the remaining two items ‘Do work of high quality’ and ‘Are enthusiastic and stimulating’ had had 13 and 9 such scores respectively.

Authority A did better than the other authorities where advisers were concerned and authority B concerning advisory teachers.

Overall we might conclude that headteachers and teachers thought well of the knowledge, skill and experience of advisers and advisory teachers.

**Comparison of the knowledge scores with those for the key areas**

The average scores for knowledge, skill and experience were compared with those for the key areas of inspection, advice and support and in-service education. The correlation (Pearson’s Product Moment Coefficient) for inspection gave a score which was significant at a level between 2 and 5%. For advice and support and teacher development the correlation was significant at the 1% level.

There would therefore seem to be a strong association between the views of headteachers and teachers of the knowledge, skill and experience of advisers and advisory teachers and their views of advisory performance in all 3 key areas.
### TABLE OF SCORES FOR KNOWLEDGE, SKILL AND EXPERIENCE

**Fig. 12.5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Av</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>B5</th>
<th>B6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D Advisers</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspectors</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D Advisers</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspectors</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores in this table are the average scores per item. Bold type indicates the highest score for that item in the questionnaire. Italic indicates the lowest score for that item in the questionnaire. Underlined scores of 2.50 or above are considered high. Underlined scores of 2.50 or above are considered high.
Comments in questionnaires
There were no comments about knowledge, skill and experience in the questionnaires apart from comments about credibility which have already been quoted in the chapters on inspection and advice and support.

Evidence from interviews

Nine statements were made about experience, skill and knowledge, some covering several points. Six came from authority A and one came from each of the other 3 authorities.

Two chief advisers made statements about their view of the knowledge, skill and experience required in advisers and inspectors:

Q What do you look for in appointing advisers?
CA Not in order of importance - intellectual ability - by that I mean that they have the ability to analyse, the ability to observe sharply, to synthesise. It's a practical intelligence if you like. A reasonable background of suitability in terms of experience and expertise. Personality, which is absolutely crucial and fundamental. If you've got the other things and you haven't got the right personality ... whereby people feel that they like to talk to (you) - I like to feel that you can have a discussion with a person. It's very much a debate, a discussion, you get into areas - educational, philosophical, intellectual in an exploratory way. Genuine meeting of minds - you feel there is a mind there you can engage with and it's interesting to talk to them. There is a basic humility and sympathy for other people and that there is potential - there's something there that they can build on themselves. If the door is open they'll take advantage of that. So experience, a practical intelligence because without that you're dull and if you can't get to the point quickly and see the issues, if you're not aware of blindness you're going to be terribly frustrating to other people. Quality of personality is very, very important and then aspects of potential.
Chief Adviser, authority B

Q Have you any thoughts about what is associated with effectiveness?
CI I think people being able to demonstrate quite high level skills in their job. For example, in working with governors, which is becoming more and more of an issue in influencing headship appointments ... Also being able to go into a school and pick up very quickly significant things about a school and know what areas to focus on so that you can really get people to address the issues they may well walk around. Being able to spot such things. I think also understanding how schools operate under LMS enables people to be very effective because its the major preoccupation at the moment ...
I think also being able to influence headteachers and members, a wide and diverse range of people to look at very challenging issues, I think makes inspectors very effective, but also in terms of making inspection reports constructive so that schools are able to take on the issues. I think the need in this day and age trying to hold on to a few educational principles and remind people of them - often - is again something concerned with effectiveness.
Chief Inspector, authority A

It is interesting to compare these statements with those of headteachers:

Q What's your picture of the effective adviser?
A Somebody who's sympathetic, communicates well, professional expertise, both particular and on the broader front and somebody who can listen.
I think delivering what they say they will deliver in terms of efficiency and knowledge and certainly quite handy for someone saying, 'I don't know but can suggest a way of your finding out' or of them finding out and getting back to you. But, you know, people who'll see things through once they've agreed (a way forward) have taken it on board to deliver then what they say they're going to deliver and I think we judge people, don't we, on their ability to deliver, to accomplish in this area.

Secondary school headteacher, authority D

The question of credibility was discussed in the chapter on inspection and advice and support (cf. pp. 166,172,173,200,203). It is also relevant here as the following comment shows:

We also questioned why none of the inspectors had had recent experience, you know, in the last 4 years, in a junior school, when all the major changes have happened in the last 4 or 5 years. So teaching experience 10 years ago is not really relevant to today's problems.

Primary school teacher, authority A

Various points were made about the particular skills which were looked for in advisers:

I think from the technology point of view when there's so much change going on at the moment ... you get the feeling on occasions that you're working in separate little outposts all doing the same things in slightly different ways, whereas you benefit greatly from hearing of the experience in other schools and how they've approached it and where there are national trends what the national trends are.... And I think in some ways the problem for us is that the advisory service is not very far ahead of where we are and things like SATs, they don't know what's going to happen yet and they're still waiting to have them delivered and so whatever comes in at the moment there's an enormous rush and the thing that you share in common is that nobody quite knows what's coming next.'

Secondary school head of department, authority A

On certain occasions I've been slightly worried about a head of department appointment, not having specialised knowledge in a particular area and you can't get it from elsewhere and on at least 3 occasions with different subjects, inspectors have taken a lot of time and trouble to come in and interview when it comes to head of department and I think that's valuable because you've got no one in your school who has expertise in science, for example, technology or whatever.

Secondary school headteacher, authority A

It is quite clear that inspectors have had quite an important role to play in terms of appraisal of heads as part of the appraisal teams and I think this has proved to be quite valuable in terms of our own development.

Secondary school headteacher, authority A

Inspectors and advisers, particularly those in a small team, were conscious of their own need to have a wide range of skills. This will become more of a problem as teams diminish.

We're all needing to learn about special needs whether it relates to our phase or subject area, so I think, particularly as our team dwindles, we do become more experts on everything.

Primary inspector, authority A
Summary

Findings in relation to the questions asked
1 Headteachers and teachers generally had positive views of the knowledge, skill and experience of inspectors, advisers and advisory teachers. The items 'Have professional expertise' and 'Have specialist skills' in particular, received good scores throughout and no item in this section of the study had a poor score.

2 The scores for knowledge, skill and experience correlated highly with those for all 3 key areas. This is very much the result which we might expect.

Other findings
1 This study shows that the qualifications and level of previous experience of advisers and inspectors in the 4 authorities are above those found in the survey by Bolam in 1978. Eighty two per cent of advisers in these 4 authorities had first degrees compared with 42% in Bolam's study. Forty eight per cent also had higher degrees which are not recorded in the Bolam study. Forty five per cent had been heads of schools in this study compared with 23% in Bolam's study. The age range has remained much the same. If these authorities are representative of the national population of advisers, this could mean that there has been a general rise in qualifications and level of experience among advisers since the Bolam survey.

2 Authority A headteachers and teachers viewed the knowledge, skill and experience of their advisers more highly than their counterparts in the other authorities. In authority B headteachers and teachers viewed the knowledge, skill and experience of advisory teachers more highly than those in the other 3 authorities.

3 Chief advisers looked for the following in advisers and inspectors: intellectual ability, the ability to analyse, the ability to observe and pick up significant points quickly in schools, knowing what areas to focus on in schools, personality, basic humility and sympathy with other people, being able to influence people, potential, skill in reporting on inspections, understanding of school finances, having educational principles.

4 Headteachers and teachers looked for the following: sympathy, good communication, professional expertise, efficiency in delivering what was agreed, skill in handling people, counselling skills, success and reputation in previous work, having clear ideas.
There was some concern about credibility but the question on credibility had 7 good scores above 2.50 and no poor scores below 2.00 which suggests that the concern about credibility expressed in comments and statements in the chapters on inspection and advice and support is not as widespread as the number of comments would lead one to believe.
13 RELATIONSHIPS

Introduction

The question of relationships between advisers, inspectors or advisory teachers and headteachers and teachers came up in most of the discussions. Unless an adviser, inspector or advisory teacher can make good relationships quickly with headteachers and teachers, his or her work is likely to be in vain. The success of advisory work depends upon the formation of relationships of trust and confidence.

Relevant literature

Gibson (1981, pp.178,181,184) looked at a small group of advisers as part of the Cambridge Accountability Project. He described the views of these advisers as follows:

All view their principal task as helping to ensure the continued improvement of the education of children in their authority's schools. To achieve this task, advisers are concerned to build a relationship of mutual trust and confidence with heads and teachers, by offering advice, guidance and support. However, advisers are clearly aware that they are, by virtue of their central task, the major channel of accountability between school and LEA.

He quoted a teacher as stressing the importance of relationships:

The whole question hinges around personal relationships and I suppose that what I realised is that the adviser's first job is to build up relationships with colleagues.

The evidence of the Cambridge study was that the good relationships which were seen as essential to the effectiveness of advisory work genuinely did exist with a high level of mutual respect:

Teachers who have regular and significant contact appear to understand the difficulties advisers face in successfully performing their diffuse and delicate task and see them as valuable colleagues.

Teachers said they respected the views of advisers because they saw a lot of schools and brought an outside view. They tended to comment on what they thought of the adviser as a person and then go on to comment on particular expertise.

Margerison (1978, p.183) noted the importance of understanding the culture and the context in which a client works and the position of the person being advised, before offering advice.

The adviser is continually trying to establish a relationship that is mutually acceptable to himself (sic) and his client. This is an on-going informal negotiation. Each person seeks permission to act in relation to the other. Each person seeks to find the common ground for dialogue and action.
Hardcastle (1988, pp.204,206) wrote of mentorship in North America, which is the role in which advisory teachers sometimes find themselves. He quoted one teacher experiencing a mentor as saying 'Gradually, as I got to know him, I discovered his confidence in me, which in turn inspired confidence in myself.’ Another spoke of the mentor as having ‘A strong and subtle sense of humour and (being) extremely perceptive’.

Gray (1987, p.11) wrote of the need of headteachers for counsellors:

I think the only way many heads will be helped to accept full responsibility as managers without wanting to escape into teaching is if they can draw on the help of experienced management counsellors. A management counsellor is a professional consultant who can talk with the head at a very personal level about the concerns of running a school and give advice on ways to tackle management problems.

Whitehead (1981, pp.14,15) in describing a piece of development work with teachers stressed the need for trust:

This trust developed gradually over a period of months as all the participants came to see that everyone was concerned to support the individual teachers in their attempts to improve the quality of education for their pupils. We also came to understand what each person had to contribute to the process.

Garnett (1977, p.34) studied 6 schools and found that teachers expected from advisers ‘sympathy, empathy, humility, tolerance, flexibility, self-assurance, competence, humour, tact and above all the ability to listen and reflect.’ The 6 advisers she studied listed ‘discretion, understanding, compassion, professional expertise, acute powers of observation’.

Strong (1992), writing of the role of the advisory services made the following points:

Real success will best be achieved by good relations with the institutions, based on consultation and cooperation which is seen to be beneficial to both LEA and schools - the latter will require goodwill on the part of both sides and will not happen without a lot of conscious effort, planning and a generous attitude.

Straker (1988, p.380) described the negotiation needed by an advisory teacher team working with teachers in one authority. One first school teacher commented:

I haven’t had an outsider in my classroom for 15 years. The thought of having an adviser come in and show me what to do was quite an ordeal. I felt insulted and also terrified.

Straker went on to describe how teachers came to recognise the benefits of this additional expertise:

After initial apprehension the two advisory teachers were recognised as fellow professionals with recent and relevant classroom experience. Even those teachers who had expressed reservations initially soon felt able to relate to the ESG (Educational Support Grant) teachers and felt comfortable with the new working relationship. For example, the teacher who had felt ‘insulted but also terrified’ commented: 'The atmosphere is excellent. They talk our language because they know what it's like to have thirty children in a classroom. They’re practical and realistic.'
The situation in the 4 authorities

Each of the four authorities made some comment about relationships in the various papers which had been produced.

Authority A, (1991, p.2) speaking of inspections made the following statement:

Inspectors will attempt to be sympathetic and unobtrusive, interfering as little as possible with the normal pattern of work.

Another document from this authority speaks of working in partnership with schools in order to assist in the processes designed to promote high standards of provision and achievement for pupils, students and other users of the service.

Authority B’s papers (1991, pp.4,8,10) also spoke of partnership with schools and collaborative reviewing of work. Information about inspection spoke of the advisory team working with individual school staffs ‘The two-fold aims are to identify together the state of the school and then to engage in a joint supportive development programme’.

A statement of of basic expectations of the advisory service contained the following:

i) Advisers must continue to provide leadership in educational thinking and practice;
ii) They must continue to work in partnership with schools, taking the role of ‘critical friend’.

Authority B also had a statement of principles for advisers containing the following:

In looking at a school or classroom advisers are entering another’s territory. It is therefore important to observe in a way that builds a professional relationship and uses the long term nature of the advisory role.

In visiting and observation good advisers are able to influence by building confidence, prompting observation or reflection, giving opportunities for development e.g. responsibility for INSET, having high expectations, valuing the complexity of the teacher’s role, valuing their commitment.

Authority C’s papers (1989, pp.1,2) also spoke of partnership and suggested that the role of advisers should be proactive. They included the following statements:

We need to be:
1 Caring professional colleagues who:
   - develop strategies for helping institutions to make sense of change;
   - actively support and encourage curriculum development;
   - inspire confidence in our ability to provide sound professional advice;
   - support heads, principals, teachers, governors, lecturers;
2 Critical friends who help teachers/lecturers:
   - engage in rigorous debate;
   - raise questions about the processes they are engaged in;
   - focus on learning;
   - create an environment where they are involved actively in self management and self monitoring;
3 Counsellors who:
   - provide support and a listening ear;
   - help raise morale;
   - help teachers/lecturers/other colleagues think through issues and come to decisions for themselves.
Authority D (1991, p.8) made the point that 'the relationship between the staff of the Inspection, Advice and Support Service and the schools and colleges of the County has many similarities to the client/consultant relationship'. They also stressed the importance of people and listening to clients. Like the other 3 authorities they were concerned to make their inspections collaborative, involving the school in the process of planning and carrying out the inspection.

The questionnaire survey

This chapter addresses the following questions:
1. How do headteachers and teachers view relationships with advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers?
2. Is there a relationship between these views and those held of the work of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers in the key areas of inspection, advice and support and teacher development?

Headteachers' views of the relationship with advisers
Headteachers were asked to state whether they agreed, were neutral or disagreed with 8 statements. Replies were scored 3 for 'agreed', 2 for 'neutral' and 1 for 'disagreed'. Scores were reasonably high with 27 (67%) out of 40 scores at 2.50 or above (good scores) and only one score averaging below 2.00 (poor score). The scores are summarised in the fold out table on page 278. Average scores were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Advisers</th>
<th>Inspectors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HEADTEACHERS' VIEWS OF RELATIONSHIPS WITH INSPECTORS AND ADVISERS

Fig. 13.1

C1 Are sensitive to school situations
C2 Are prepared to listen
C3 Treat headteachers as professional colleagues
C4 Are professional
C7 Are supportive to headteachers
C8 Give headteachers confidence
C9 Communicate effectively
C10 Are clear and concise in the suggestions they offer
Authority A had all scores above 2.50 and also had the highest score for every item. Authority B had good scores for all but one score and the lowest score for none. Authority C had 6 of the 8 scores above 2.50 and the lowest score for none. Authority D advisers had 5 good scores and the lowest score for none while authority D inspectors had only one item above 2.50, the lowest score for every item and one score below 2.00. It is perhaps not surprising that inspectors should score badly in this section in that teachers have already been shown in other chapters to be somewhat threatened by the idea of inspectors. (cf pp.167,8,9,178)

Authority A had very good scores for ‘Are prepared to listen’ (2.90), ‘Treat headteachers as professional colleagues’ (2.90) ‘Are professional’ (2.98), ‘Are supportive to headteachers’ (2.90). Their lowest score was for ‘Give headteachers confidence’ (2.66).

Authority B had good scores for ‘Treat headteachers as professional colleagues’ (2.80), ‘Are professional’ (2.76) and ‘Are supportive to headteachers’ (2.76). Their lowest score was for ‘Are clear and concise in the suggestions they offer’ (2.48).

Authority C had good scores for ‘Treat headteachers as professional colleagues’ (2.86), ‘Are professional’ (2.93) and ‘Are supportive to headteachers’ (2.76). Their lowest score was for ‘Are clear and concise in the suggestions they offer’ (2.38).

The highest score for Authority D advisers was ‘Treat headteachers as professional colleagues’ (2.79). Their lowest score was for ‘Give headteachers confidence’ (2.26). The inspectors highest score was also for ‘Treat headteachers as professional colleagues’ (2.62) and their lowest score for ‘Give headteachers confidence’ (1.98). They also had comparatively low but satisfactory scores for ‘Communicate effectively’ (2.17) and ‘Are clear and concise in the suggestions they offer’ (2.14).

One item ‘Treat headteachers as professional colleagues’ had scores above 2.50 throughout. Four other items had 4 out of the 5 scores above 2.50. They were ‘Are sensitive to school situations’, ‘Are prepared to listen’, ‘Are professional’ and ‘Are supportive to headteachers’. The lowest scoring item was ‘Are clear and concise in the suggestions they offer’ which had only one score above 2.50.

**Headteachers’ views of the relationships with advisory teachers**

Headteachers were asked to agree, remain neutral or disagree with the same statements for advisory teachers as for advisers and inspectors except for one item ‘Give headteachers confidence’. Scores were generally high with 21 (75%) above 2.50 and none below 2.00. They are summarised in the fold out table. Average scores were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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AUTHORITY A

AUTHORITY B

AUTHORITY C

AUTHORITY D

C1 Are sensitive to school situations
C2 Are prepared to listen
C3 Treat headteachers as professional colleagues
C4 Are professional
C7 Are supportive to headteachers
C9 Communicate effectively
C10 Are clear and concise in the suggestions they offer
Authority A had 5 of the 7 scores above 2.50 and had the highest score for one item and the lowest score for 2. Authority B had all items above 2.50 and had the highest scores for 3 items and the lowest scores for none. Authority C had 5 good scores, with the highest scores for 3 and the lowest scores for 2. Authority D had 4 good scores and the lowest scores for 3.

Authority A’s highest scores were for ‘Treat headteachers as professional colleagues’ (2.77) and ‘Are professional’ (2.82). Their lowest score was for ‘Are sensitive to school situations’ (2.23).

Authority B’s highest scores were for ‘Are prepared to listen’ (2.80), for ‘Treat headteachers as professional colleagues’ (2.76) and ‘Are professional’ (2.76). Their lowest score was for ‘Communicate effectively’ (2.56).

Authority C had high scores for ‘Treat headteachers as professional colleagues’ (2.80) and ‘Are supportive to headteachers’ (2.76). Their lowest scores were for ‘Are sensitive to school situations’ (2.48) and ‘Are clear and concise in the suggestions they offer’ (2.48).

Authority D had high scores for ‘Treat headteachers as professional colleagues’ (2.70) and ‘Are professional’ (2.73). Their lowest score was for ‘Are clear and concise in the suggestions they offer’ (2.19).

Four of the items had all good scores. These were ‘Are prepared to listen’, ‘Treat headteachers as professional colleagues’, ‘Are professional’ and ‘Are supportive to headteachers’. Two items had only one score above 2.50. These were ‘Are sensitive to school situations’ and ‘Are clear and concise in the suggestions they offer’. The remaining item, ‘Communicate effectively’ had good scores from 3 of the 4 authorities.

**Teachers’ views of the relationship with advisers and inspectors**

Teachers were asked to evaluate the same statements as headteachers except that 2 had been added. These were ‘Are approachable’ and ‘Are non-threatening.’ Scoring was carried out in a similar way. Teachers had a poorer view of their relationship with advisers and inspectors than headteachers. There were only 21 good scores of (42%) out of 50 possible scores compared with 67% from headteachers. Scores are summarised on the fold out table. Average scores were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.49 for advisers 2.25 for inspectors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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C1 Are sensitive to school situations
C2 Are prepared to listen
C3 Treat teachers as professional colleagues
C4 Are professional
C5 Are approachable
C6 Are non-threatening
C7 Are supportive to teachers
C8 Give teachers confidence
C9 Communicate effectively
C10 Are clear and concise in the suggestions they offer
Authority A had scores of 2.50 or above for 5 of the 10 items and had the highest score for 5 and the lowest score for none. Authority B also had good scores for 5 items and had the highest score for one item and the lowest score for 4. Authority C had 6 good scores and had the highest score for 4 items and the lowest score for none. Authority D’s advisers had 5 scores of 2.50 or above but neither the highest or the lowest score for any item. Authority D inspectors had one item of 2.50 and one below 2.00. They had the lowest score for 6 items.

Authority A had high scores for ‘Treat teachers as professional colleagues’ (2.83) and ‘Are professional’ (2.93). Their lowest scores were for ‘Are non-threatening’ (2.29) ‘Give teachers confidence’ (2.36).

Authority B had a high score for ‘Are professional’ (2.83) and low scores for ‘Give teachers confidence’ (2.10), ‘Communicate effectively’ (2.14) and ‘Are clear and concise in the suggestions they offer’ (2.00).

Authority C had high scores for ‘Treat teachers as professional colleagues’ (2.83) and ‘Are professional’ (2.92). Their lowest score was for ‘Are clear and concise in the suggestions they offer’ (2.17).

Authority D advisers highest score was for ‘Are prepared to listen’ (2.67) and their lowest score was for ‘Are clear and concise in the suggestions they offer’ (2.26). The inspectors’ highest score was for ‘Are prepared to listen’ (2.50) and their lowest score was for ‘Are non-threatening’ (1.92). This is perhaps an expected result. We have already seen in chapter 8 that teachers tend to regard inspectors as threatening.

Only one item has good scores for all the authorities. This is ‘Are prepared to listen’. ‘Are supportive to teachers’ had a score of 2.50 or above for all but the inspectors in authority D. Four items, ‘Are sensitive to school situations’, ‘Give teachers confidence’, Communicate effectively’ and ‘Are clear and concise in the suggestions they offer’ had no good scores but no poor scores either.

Teachers’ views of the relationship with advisory teachers
Teachers have a much more favourable view of relationships advisory teachers than they have of relationships with advisers. Thirty of the 40 items (75%) had scores of 2.50 or above compared with 42% for advisers. The equivalent for headteachers was 67%. A summary of scores can be seen in the graphs on the next page and on the fold out table. The average scores were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Authority A had 8 out of the 10 scores above 2.50 but had none of the highest and 2 of the lowest scores sharing one with authority C. Authority B had all scores above 2.50 and had the highest scores for every item. Authority C had 6 scores of 2.50 or above and 5 of the lowest scores. Authority D had 6 scores of 2.50 or above and 4 of the lowest scores.

Authority A had high scores for ‘Are professional’ (2.83) and ‘Are approachable’ (2.78). Their lowest score was for ‘Are sensitive to school situations’ (2.46).

Authority B had good scores throughout, with very high scores for ‘Are prepared to listen’ (2.96), ‘Are professional’ (2.96), ‘Are approachable’ (2.96) and ‘Are non-threatening’ (2.96). Their lowest score, still a good one, was for ‘Give teachers confidence’ (2.74).

Authority C had very high scores for ‘Are professional’ (2.95) and ‘Are non-threatening’ (2.91). Their lowest score was for ‘Are sensitive to school situations’ (2.14).

Authority D’s highest scores were for ‘Are prepared to listen’ (2.77) and ‘Are approachable’ (2.77). Their lowest score was for ‘Communicate effectively’ (2.37).

Six of the 10 items had good scores from all 4 authorities. These were: ‘Are prepared to listen’, ‘Treat teachers as professional colleagues’, ‘Are professional’, ‘Are approachable’, ‘Are non-threatening’, ‘Are supportive to teachers’. Of the remaining 4 items 2 had good scores from 2 of the authorities and the remaining 2 from one only. These were ‘Are sensitive to school situations’ and ‘Are clear and concise in the suggestions they offer’. There were no poor scores.

**Overall view of scores for relationships**

One item had good scores throughout. This was ‘Are prepared to listen’. Another had good scores for all but 2 items: This was ‘Are professional’. ‘Treat headteachers as professional colleagues’ and ‘Are supportive to headteachers/teachers’ had only two scores below 2.50. It is interesting to note that in all 3 cases one of the scores below 2.50 was that of inspectors in authority D, who were working in a rather different role from the advisers in the other authorities. ‘Are sensitive to school situations’ had 6 good scores. ‘Are approachable,’ which applied to teachers only, had good scores for all the items except for authority D’s inspectors. ‘Are non-threatening’ had good scores for all but 4 of the 9 items. Authority D’s inspectors had a poor score for this item, the only one among all those for relationships. ‘Give headteachers/teachers confidence’ had 4 good scores, ‘Communicate effectively’ had 8 and ‘Are clear and concise in the suggestions they offer’ had only 3.

Authority A had 26 good scores (74%). Authority B had 29 which was 83%. Authority C had 23 good scores or 66%. Authority D advisers achieved 20 good scores (57%) and their inspectors had only 12 or 34%, which is perhaps understandable and may be caused by the role rather than the people concerned. Authority A had the highest average scores for advisers.
from both headteachers (2.83) and teachers (2.58) and authority B for advisory teachers (2.69) and (2.88). Headteachers valued the relationships of advisers more highly than advisory teachers and teachers valued the relationships of advisory teachers more highly than those with advisers.

It could be concluded from these results that the relationships of the advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers in these four authorities were felt by headteachers and teachers to be good.

Comparison of the relationships scores with those for the key areas

The average scores for relationships were compared with those for the key areas of inspection, advice and support and in-service education. The correlation coefficient for inspection was 0.155 which was not significant. For advice and support, $r = 0.719$, which was significant at the 1% level. The result for teacher development was $r = 0.650$ which was significant at the 5% level.

These results are not very surprising. Advice and support is not likely to be successful unless relationships are good and the scores above show that in the 4 authorities concerned this was the case. The same is true of in-service education. Where inspection is concerned we have already seen in the chapter on inspection that teachers see it as something of a threat and however careful the inspectors may be to establish relationships, they are not likely to be seen as having the same kind of good relationships as those concerned with advising. This view was supported by the lower scores for the inspectors in authority D. This does not mean that good relationships are unimportant in inspection, merely that they are harder to achieve.
### Table of Scores for Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Advisers</th>
<th>Inspectors</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Advisers</th>
<th>Inspectors</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Advisers</th>
<th>Inspectors</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Advisers</th>
<th>Inspectors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>Authority D Advisers</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D Inspectors</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D Inspectors</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D Advisers</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores in this table are the average scores per item.

**Bold type**
- The highest score for that item in the questionnaire.
- The lowest score for that item in the questionnaire.

**Italic**
- Scores over 2.50
- Scores below 2.00

**Underlined**
- Scores over 2.50
- Scores below 2.00

**Surrounding rectangle**
- Scores between 2.50 and 2.00

**Notes**
- C1 Are sensitive to school situations
- C2 Are prepared to listen
- C3 Treat headteachers/teachers as professional colleagues
- C4 Are professional
- C5 Are approachable
- C6 Are non-threatening
- C7 Are supportive to headteachers/teachers
- C8 Give headteachers/teachers confidence
- C9 Communicate effectively
- C10 Are clear and concise in the suggestions they offer


Comments in questionnaires

Only 2 comments were made in the questionnaires about relationships. They were as follows:

Inevitably some advisers are better than others at establishing relationships with heads and teachers and they are therefore more effective.

_Primary school headteacher, authority A_

"The traditional view held by many teachers of the inspectorate as a group of people to be revered still holds although the personal nature and qualities of some of them make them far more approachable than others.

_Primary school teacher, authority A_

Evidence from interviews

Eighteen comments were made about relationships in the course of the interviews. Ten of these were from authority A, 3 each from authorities B and D and 2 from authority C.

A number of the comments were about the importance of building a relationship with the head and staff of the school:

"It is important to build up relationships with the people who are coming in so that you can set a dialogue which is good and supportive and developmental.

_Primary school headteacher, authority B_

I think an attached inspector is actually a very good relationship to maintain because they really do get to know that they have a real part to play in evaluating and assessing progress in the school.

_Secondary school headteacher, authority A_

My general adviser is also adviser for the family of primary schools and that cross phase link has been absolutely vital in terms of setting up the relationship and working relationships that progress from Key stage 2 to Key stage 3 and to be able to work to an adviser on that has been quite a useful thing.

_Community College Principal, authority C_

Q What about positive things about advisers?

A There’s somebody you can ring up and say, ‘Can I have a chat?’ Sometimes it gets a bit like that. You feel you want somebody to talk to. That, of course, becomes a personal thing - the relationship you have with the adviser.

_Primary school headteacher, authority B_

A The effective adviser establishes the relationship with the school, with the head, with the teachers in it and on the basis of a good relationship, challenges everyone in the school professionally.

B Encourages good practice as well - positive encouragement has the biggest influence on the staff.

C When you’ve got it right, you can say “That’s great, I love that - have you seen - - ?” ... but you have to have the relationship first. What I’m saying is that I think, if folk go in without the relationship ... it’s deaf ears.

D Isn’t that how relationships are established also - that you are pointing out the positive and giving some positive strobes so that you are opening up that person to receive the development that you want to give them.
C You need both is what we’re saying. I think sometimes folk go in with one without the other.

D Yes. I think they do. And I think they go in and try to establish relationships without looking for something positive that they can comment on for that head, that teacher.

*Primary Headteachers, authority B*

Some speakers stressed the importance of personal qualities in advisers and advisory teachers:

> I think the most important of all. I think are the personal qualities - that the moment they come into the school, they’ve got a direct relationship with staff. The relationship is set in a very positive way so it does depend on the personal qualities of that person, inspector or advisory teacher, regardless of their experience or particular brief or the area, because at the end of the day you want the member of staff who’s receiving them to be reflective. You want them to take on some of the issues that have come across or happened in a very positive atmosphere where there’s trust and understanding and professionalism between the teacher and whoever it is, inspector or advisory teacher.

*Junior school headteacher, authority A*

A I can talk in confidence, you know, on a personal issue, if I wished, without any hesitation at all and that’s nice to know.

B Depends on the individual, doesn’t it, but if you’ve got the right person, it’s a source of tremendous strength for us to know that you can talk like this.

C It’s the chemistry mix.

A That’s right. Perhaps the selection procedure in the past has never actually thought that was an important part and so they’ve actually not put that on the list.

B Or it’s not been addressed as a group, how they look at their relationship with the head, the confidentiality but the support that at the same time they can give the head. And particularly in this climate now, the support that we can give them.

C Yes. It’s a two-way process. It’s a support of equals which is important. It’s almost an element of mentoring in it, isn’t there? You know, you can switch roles, you can listen without providing answers, ask appropriate questions in a two-way process which has certainly helped me and hopefully has helped my inspector as well.

*Secondary headteachers, Authority D*

> 'It does depend on the personality and that’s either going to be its strength or its greatest weakness. I don’t know how you can move away from that.'

*Primary school headteacher, authority C*

There was an awareness that relationships were changing with the recent legislation and the changes in the roles of LEA and headteachers and governors:

Since the National Curriculum came in, it’s changing from information gathering to more of a schools’ inspection service which ... is moving away from being a critical friend to the inspection ... which has created tensions within schools because they’re unsure what role the advisers come into school with.

*Primary school headteacher, authority B*
I think we're picking up under the 1988 Act, with the shift in role, the changing relationship with the LEAs and schools, with LMS (Local Management of Schools) that the LEAs are finding it extremely difficult to adopt the right sort of culture as it were, to represent our changing relationships.

Having said that I feel that they've made great strides (in our authority). They are more responsive. The language of reports and advice is more guarded. They've made progress. The going hasn't always been easy but it has happened and it is happening.

Secondary school headteachers, authority A

I think someone who comes in and makes good and valid criticisms is actually more helpful than somebody who comes in and says it's all lovely.

Nursery school headteacher, authority A

It's been made very clear by the inspectorate with our regular visits, the pastoral attached inspector, where we set the agenda for the visit, there's a moment for the coordinators to give some input, there's a moment for reflection.

Primary school headteacher, authority A

There were some comments about relationships or events which went wrong:

Now he doesn't have any knowledge other than his liaison prior to the visit with his advisory team of that particular curriculum area. The staff know this and they know he'll have to do his homework at a theoretical level before he comes into school. He has no practical credibility at all with the staff and because of his communication and personal problems in that he can't make any kind of relationship, they are very, very anxious and up tight about it and there isn't a lot I can do.

Primary school headteacher, authority D

The chief inspector here had not visited us for many, many, many years, not since she was chief inspector and a visit was arranged and my staff found that much more worrying than our attached inspector. Now she was actually coming to see me and she was going to look through the school...When she had to cancel at the last minute the staff were absolutely furious because they'd got themselves tensed up for her coming.

Nursery school headteacher, authority A

The thing, I think, to add to that is that they are somebody, yes, who has got those views but has also got the tact and diplomacy to know when to say. I mean we had an unfortunate situation where something was said very wrong and it's destroyed totally relationship. They've got to be almost able to know when to say it and when not.

Primary school headteacher, authority A

A I think an awful lot depends for success in our terms of the inspection actually depends on the charisma, the body language and the different personalities of the team. If the body language gives the impression 'I am here to inspect', staff will react in a particular way.

Q What body language conveys 'I am here to inspect'?

A Clipboard. Sitting at the back, making, visibly making notes and the fact that there was very little communication. For example, an inspector might go into the room. There might be a verbal exchange, but it was very 'I'm here to inspect' and sit back and just carry on and then after the session there might have been a word but nothing in the way of sign language, the warmth, the smile, perhaps a little bit of a joke of something about a particular child - those sort of things would have helped to break it down.

Primary school headteacher, authority A
In the past there’s been a feeling that an advisory teacher might have a particular point of view and push it regardless of the school’s individual policies or the individual member of staff which therefore caused a reaction which was often negative.

*Primary school headteacher, authority A*

It’s to do with personality, credibility. The way they (advisory teachers) relate to children. The staff are very quick to pick up advisory staff that are good at it and those that aren’t. The ones that will take the class and the ones that will only work with 2 children.

*Primary school headteacher, authority D*

One person brought out the point that schools were happier when they were clear about the functions of those visiting them:

I see a problem where you have an inspectorate service that one the one hand advise and on the other hand inspect and the same person can be doing both so that they may only be wearing one hat at a time but you know that there is always the other hat that they can put on and so it has to be defined prior to a visit as to whether they’re there in a pastoral or advisory capacity or whether it is actually inspectorial.

*Primary headteacher, authority A*

These comments all confirm the difficulty advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers have in that they are expected to make good relationships with people if they are to be effective. While this is true of any work with people, advisory work carries the particular difficulty that the time for making the relationship is very short indeed and the adviser is also in the role of critical friend. It is much easier to be a friend if one does not have to be critical and easier to be critical once you have been accepted as a friend but there may not be time to establish friendship. This will certainly be the case with the new arrangements for inspection and the fact that advisory staff will be much more thinly spread in the future (cf. chapter 5 on the national survey) also means that they will known well by fewer teachers and headteachers. Where advisory teams are marketing their services the ability to make good relationships quickly will be very important.

**Summary**

*Findings in relation to the questions asked*

1. Headteachers and teachers regard the relationships with advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers as good. Headteachers think more highly of relationships with advisers than do teachers who think more highly of advisory teachers’ relationships than do headteachers. Headteachers rate relationships with advisers more highly than those with advisory teachers and teachers rate relationships with advisory teachers more highly than those with advisers. These are not very surprising findings since headteachers tend to have more contact with advisers than advisory teachers and teachers have a closer contact with advisory teachers.
2 There is a strong correlation between views of relationships and views of advice and support, significant at the 1% level. The correlation between views of relationships and views of teacher development is significant at the 5% level. That between views of inspection and views of relationships is not significant.

Other findings

1 Authority A had the highest scores for every item in the questionnaire on headteachers’ views of advisers and inspectors with all scores above 2.50. They also had the highest average scores for views of advisers for both headteachers and teachers. Authority D inspectors had the lowest score for every item for views of headteachers but it is suggested that this is partly due to teachers’ perception of the role of inspectors.

2 Authority B had the highest scores for teachers’ views of advisory teachers with all scores above 2.50. They had the highest average scores from headteachers and teachers for views of advisory teachers.

3 The evidence from the interviews suggests that if advisers are unable to make good relationships they are limited in effectiveness. This ability will be even more important in the new pattern of working where schools will decide whether they want the services of the advisory staff. They will want people who will appear credible and make good relationships very quickly.
14 THE CULTURE AND CLIMATE OF THE ADVISORY TEAM

Introduction

People within an organisation experience that organisation in various ways. This chapter is concerned with how the members of the advisory teams in the study view their organisations and the effect of this on their work in the key areas.

Relevant literature

A number of writers about effective organisations have suggested that they have a strong culture. For example Deal (1985, pp. 602, 605, 608) put forward the proposition that 'understanding the symbols and culture of a school is a prerequisite to making the school more effective'. He suggested that policy-making has its chief influence by changing or revitalising collective sentiments, values or beliefs. He went on to define what he meant by culture:

Culture is an expression that tries to capture the informal, implicit - often unconscious - side of business or any human organisation. Although there are many definitions of the term, culture in everyday usage is typically described as 'the way we do things here'. It consists of patterns of thought, behaviour and artefacts that symbolise and give meaning to the workplace. Meaning derives from the elements of culture: shared values and beliefs, heroes and heroines, ritual and ceremony, stories, and an informal network of cultural players. Effective businesses typically show a remarkable consistency across these cultural elements.

He develops this further in relation to schools:

In schools where diverse expectations, political vulnerability, and the lack of tangible products make values, beliefs and faith crucial in determining success, the development of a solid culture is even more important than it might be in business.

If this is the case, there is an even stronger case for developing a solid culture for advisory teams since the lack of tangible products is even greater and the values, belief and faith even more important in the advisory service than in schools.

Beare et al (1989, p.14, 137) noted that the best schools had developed a common culture and a shared vision. They suggested that the culture of a school:

begins to show in the way the school is run, its furnishings, its rewards and punishments, the way its members are organised and controlled, who has power and influence, which members are honoured, which behaviours are remarked upon. All these things create the school climate.

These things were evident in all schools, but they suggested that it was where the culture is a shared one that it became effective in influencing everyone who was part of the school.
They made the point that the culture of a school depended upon the values held by the headteacher and staff. The school needed to develop a philosophy which was based upon shared values and which informed everything that happened. They described this as:

A statement of assumptions, values and beliefs about the nature and the purpose of schooling, of learning and teaching processes and processes which support learning and teaching.

They suggested that philosophy started with the headteacher and governors and that its development involved the staff and to some extent the parents and students with many opportunities for people to talk about what they most valued in education, often in the context of making decisions about an aspect of the work. Decisions were referred back to a set of beliefs and and values to see if they accorded. All of this might well apply to an advisory team.

Every organisation has a culture and a climate of its own and the quality of this may determine how effectively it operates. Little (1986, p.331,333,339) studied the way teachers learn ‘on the job’. This has implications for the way in which advisers might learn ‘on the job.’ She chose six schools which were representative of different patterns of academic success and teacher involvement in in-service training. She interviewed 105 teachers and 14 senior managers as well as observing what happened. She concluded that more successful schools were differentiated from the less successful by ‘patterned norms of interaction amongst staff.’

She found four classes of interaction which could be called ‘collegial’:

1. Teachers engage in frequent, continuous and increasingly concrete and precise talk about teaching practice. This builds up a shared language about teaching.
2. Teachers undertake observation and give feedback on actual teaching.
3. Teachers plan, design, research and evaluate and prepare materials together.
4. Teachers teach each other the practice of teaching.

In the more successful schools all four of these activities occurred widely throughout the week and throughout the building.

It was difficult to encounter teachers when they were not engaged in some discussion about classroom practice. ... By contrast, in the less successful schools teachers were likely to report that they restricted formal meetings to administrative business and were more likely to consider the faculty lounge as off limits to serious discussion.

She concluded that the school as a workplace was extraordinarily powerful. The pattern of interaction among the staff created possibilities and set limits.

Staff development appears to have the greatest prospects for influence where there is a prevailing norm of collegiality. ... By the nature of the talk they hear, the meetings they witness and the appraisal they receive, teachers learn a stance towards classroom practice. ... Staff development appears to have the greatest prospects for influence where there is a prevailing norm of analysis, evaluation and experimentation.
The words adviser, advisory teacher or inspector might be substituted for teacher and the shared language and discussion about teaching become shared language and discussion about advisory work.

Whitaker (1990b, p.20) described how a culture is built:

The culture is 'the way that people interact and relate to each other and the behaviour they display in the working environment. It includes the ways that values and attitudes are demonstrated, how issues of motivation are dealt with, how power and authority is exercised and how conflicts resolved.'

He suggested that there were 4 questions to be considered when attempting to build a culture. There was a need to think about the specific values to be promulgated. There should be consideration of role boundaries and how authority was defined and shared. There was also a need for thought about how issues of culture and climate were to be dealt with. All staff needed to be involved with identifying values and with the declared mission of the service. Leadership should reflect the corporate values. Issues of culture should be discussed from time to time. Communication should be open and positive.

Higginbottom and Conway (1990, p. 16,17) described the way in which the Barnsley team set about creating 'a team climate which is supportive but not cosy to the degree that there is little challenge.' They stressed particularly the importance of evaluating their work and took as a model of team development 'shared decision making, professional creativity, collaboration and social and professional support.'

Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) wrote of the need for external facilitators of change to have the support of a team for their activities.

Dimmock (1982, p. 170) wrote of the micropolitical climate in any organisation. He stressed that there was a plurality of interests at work, including personal, professional and political interests and that these could conflict and were difficult to disentangle:

Personal interests would include autonomy, status, territory and rewards. Professional interests involve commitments to forms of practice ... Political interests may involve the pursuit of power for its own sake,

Although this is written with schools in mind much of it applies to advisory teams. The same potential conflicts are present.

The situation in the 4 authorities
In all 4 authorities there was evidence from documentation and discussion that advisers had been involved in discussion about overall aims and about planning. This was less true of the advisory teachers who were involved in such discussion at a local level in many cases but not usually with the whole advisory team.

Authority A had had a new chief inspector as well as a new chief education officer in 1989 and their present culture had developed very much as a result of the work of the present
chief inspector. Decisions were nearly always taken as a whole team, since the team was small enough to do this and there was a very positive outlook. The team was not really seen as including advisory teachers who had little involvement in decision making.

Authority B had had many years of stability under the same chief adviser without too many changes. Inspection was developing slowly with careful evaluation of practice. This was still giving the team a feeling of security at the time of the field work but the chief adviser has now left to work independently and the team is facing tremendous changes. There was a mixture of decision making by senior advisers and the chief adviser and involvement of the whole team. The outlook was generally positive. Advisory teachers were not involved in decision making or seen as part of the advisory team.

Authority C had seen major changes over recent years. The tradition in this authority had been for a supportive advisory service which came into schools at the headteacher’s request. The changes brought about by the Education Reform Act and the advent of a new chief adviser whose task was to implement them had not been easy for this team or for the schools who were used to a different culture. The team was undertaking general work for the first time and were organised in area teams as well as developing inspection. Some people had a very positive outlook about these changes. Others found them difficult. Advisory teachers were seen as part of the area teams and there were a number of semi-autonomous teams of advisory teachers with their own leaders.

Authority D had also undergone extensive changes following the Education Reform Act. In particular a new chief education officer decided, against the wishes of most of the team, that inspection and advice should be separated with different teams undertaking each activity. This had been well organised and there had been much discussion about both aspects of the work and people were gradually coming to terms with an organisation which many, probably the majority, felt was wrong. However, they realised that this was the pattern which was to be introduced nationally and felt that they had perhaps benefited from having had advance experience of a separated team. Advisory teachers were involved to some extent. Since the fieldwork, the assistant education officer in charge of the team has left to work independently and his work has been taken over by the chief adviser.

The questionnaire survey

This chapter addresses the following questions:

1. How far do advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers feel themselves to be part of a team culture and climate?

2. Is there a relationship between these views and those held of the work of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers in the key areas of inspection, advice and support and teacher development?
The set of criteria headed ‘climate, culture, organisation and management’ was originally seen as one set of criteria. As the replies to the questionnaires were analysed, however, it became clear that some criteria referred to organisation and management and some to climate and culture. This chapter deals with only those items which are concerned with climate and culture. The other items will be dealt with in the next chapter under the heading ‘Organisation and management’.

There were some unsatisfactory features of this part of the study. There was some confusion on the part of advisers and inspectors and more particularly advisory teachers in the larger authorities about whether the word ‘team’ referred to the whole advisory team or to one of the many sub-teams. The advisory teachers almost universally interpreted the word in terms of sub-teams because they tended in all four authorities not to be seen as part of the main advisory team. With hindsight it would have been a good idea to make this clearer. The results would certainly have been different had this been done. On the other hand, it could be argued that the benefits of team membership are what is important and in that respect it does not really matter if people see themselves as part of smaller teams and are getting the benefit of team membership.

A second problem was that advisory teachers were much less ready to send in the questionnaires than advisers and there was a very poor return from authorities B and D. In authority A there was 89% response from advisory teachers. Only 4 advisory teachers (22%) replied to the questionnaire in authority B and all of these agreed with every statement. In authority C 50% replied. In authority D only 6 people (10%) replied. This was particularly disappointing in that authority B, teachers and headteachers were very positive in their views of advisory teachers and it would have been helpful to have had more evidence of why that should be. In consequence the information from advisory teachers is unrepresentative.

Advisers views about team climate
Advisers were asked whether they agreed, were neutral or disagreed with 7 statements about the advisory team. Scores were generally high with 8 items (23%) gaining the full score of 3.00 and only 5 scores below the ‘good’ level i.e. 30 or 86% of the scores were at 2.50 or above. The full range of scores can be seen in the graphs on the next page and on the fold out table on page 293. Average scores were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.73 for advisers 2.62 for inspectors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADVISERS’ AND INSPECTORS VIEWS OF THE CLIMATE AND CULTURE OF THE ADVISORY TEAM

Fig. 14.1

G1 I feel I am part of a team
G7 I meet regularly with colleagues
G8 I discuss fundamental issues with colleagues
G9 I work with colleagues
G10 I know the skills of my colleagues
G11 I support my colleagues
G12 I find colleagues supportive
Authority A had good scores for every item and the highest scores for 6 of the 7 items with 4 scores of 3.00. Authority B also had scores of 2.50 or above for every item and 3 scores of 3.00, each sharing the highest score with authority A. Authority C had 4 good scores but the lowest scores for 4 items. Authority D advisers had the highest score for 2 items, with one 3.00, sharing this with authorities A and B. Their other scores were 2.50 or above. Authority D inspectors had good scores for 5 items and the lowest score for 2. There were no poor scores.

Authority A had scores of 3.00 for 'I feel I am part of a team', 'I meet regularly with colleagues', 'I support my colleagues' and 'I find colleagues supportive'. Their lowest scores which were still good scores, were for 'I discuss fundamental issues with colleagues' (2.78) and 'I work with colleagues' (2.78).

Authority B had scores of 3.00 for 'I meet regularly with colleagues', 'I support my colleagues' and 'I find colleagues supportive'. Their lowest scores were for 'I feel I am part of a team' (2.54), 'I discuss fundamental issues with colleagues' (2.54) and 'I know the skills of my colleagues' (2.54).

Authority C's highest score was for 'I find colleagues supportive' (2.94). Their lowest score was for 'I know the skills of my colleagues' (2.26).

Authority D advisers had a score of 3.00 for 'I meet regularly with colleagues'. Their lowest score was for 'I discuss fundamental issues with colleagues' (2.50). The inspectors' highest scores were for 'I meet regularly with colleagues' (2.86) and 'I work with colleagues' (2.86) and their lowest score was for 'I discuss fundamental issues with colleagues' (2.21).

Four items had good scores from all 4 authorities - 'I meet regularly with colleagues', 'I work with colleagues', 'I support my colleagues' and 'I find colleagues supportive'.

Advisory teachers’ views of team climate
As had already been explained, the conclusions which can be drawn from the scores from authorities B and D are doubtful. All the scores were above 2.50 and authority B had scores of 3.00 throughout, which was unlikely if more advisory teachers had replied. The scores are summarised on the fold out table. Comments suggested that most people thought in terms of sub-teams rather than the whole advisory team. For example, one advisory teacher made the following comment and there were others like it some of which are listed in the next section:

The first section was answered with the smaller curriculum support team in mind. The answers would have been different if answered for the organisation as a whole.
Advisory teacher, authority C

Average scores for this section were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADVISORY TEACHERS' VIEWS OF THE CLIMATE AND CULTURE OF THE ADVISORY TEAM

Fig. 14.2

G1 I feel I am part of a team
G7 I meet regularly with colleagues
G8 I discuss fundamental issues with colleagues
G9 I work with colleagues
G10 I know the skills of my colleagues
G11 I support my colleagues
G12 I find colleagues supportive
Authority B had an average of 3.00 and therefore had the highest scores for every item. Authority D also had 3.00 for 'I feel I am part of a team', 'I work with colleagues' and 'I support my colleagues'. Authority C had the lowest scores for all but one item and this was held by authority D.

Authority A's highest score was for 'I work with colleagues' (2.94) and their lowest scores were for 'I discuss fundamental issues with colleagues' (2.71) and 'I know the skills of my colleagues' (2.71).

Authority C's highest score was for 'I support my colleagues' (2.71), their lowest score for 'I feel I am part of a team' (2.50) and 'I discuss fundamental issues with colleagues' (2.50).

The highest scores from authority D were 3.00s for 'I feel I am part of a team', 'I work with colleagues' and 'I support my colleagues'. Their lowest scores were for 'I meet regularly with colleagues' (2.67) and 'I discuss fundamental issues with colleagues' (2.67).

**Overall view of scores for climate**

Scores for climate were universally high with all the averages above 2.50 and 4 of the 7 sets of scores all in the good category. These were 'I meet regularly with colleagues', 'I work with colleagues', 'I support my colleagues' and 'I find colleagues supportive'.

Authorities A and B had good scores for all items from both advisers and advisory teachers. Authority C had good scores for all the advisory teacher items and for 4 of the 7 scores relating to advisers. In authority D advisers had good scores throughout but inspectors had 2 scores below 2.50 for views of climate.

**Comparison of climate scores with those for the key areas**

The climate scores are somewhat different from those representing the views of teachers and headteachers in that there are only 9 sets of scores, those for advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers, rather than the 18 sets of scores, representing headteachers' views of advisers and advisory teachers and teachers' views of advisers and advisory teachers. It was therefore necessary to compare the scores with those for headteachers and teachers separately. It was not possible to compare scores for inspection because this would mean correlating 4 scores at a time which was too few to give a reasonable result.

The correlation between advice and support and climate is at a level between 5% and 10% of significance for headteachers and similarly for teachers and neither is therefore significant. The in-service correlation is highly significant at a level of 1% for both groups.

The difference is not easy to account for. It could be that the climate of the advisory team comes over more clearly in the context of in-service work than in the school situation which tends to be one to one. These results would seem to confirm the importance of team culture and climate suggested in the literature as a basis for effectiveness in at least this part of the work of the advisory service.
### TABLE OF SCORES FOR CULTURE AND CLIMATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Views</th>
<th>Authority A</th>
<th>Authority B</th>
<th>Authority C</th>
<th>Authority D Advisers</th>
<th>Authority D Inspectors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views</td>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores in this table are the average scores per item.

Bold type: The highest score for that item in the questionnaire.

Italic: The lowest score for that item in the questionnaire.

Underlined: Scores of 2.50 or above.

Rectangle outline: Scores below 2.00.

- **G1**: I feel I am part of a team.
- **G7**: I meet regularly with colleagues.
- **G8**: I discuss fundamental issues with colleagues.
- **G9**: I work with colleagues.
- **G10**: I know the skills of my colleagues.
- **G11**: I support my colleagues.
- **G12**: I find colleagues supportive.
Comments in questionnaires

Advisers and advisory teachers were given the chance to comment in the questionnaires and a 15 comments were made about advisory teams. It was noted earlier that there was confusion about which teams the questionnaire referred to. The following comments exemplified this:

Many of my comments (on climate) would refer to my position with the team at the science centre but they would also be true of my relationships with many of the advisers.
Adviser, authority D

My role sees me as a member of a number of teams - they do not all offer the same involvement and support.
Advisory teacher, authority D

I refer to the early years team as opposed to the wider context of the advisory service as a whole.
Advisory teacher, authority D

I have answered the questions as far as possible from my specific post as special needs advisory teacher. I do work closely with TVEI (Technical and Vocational Initiative) colleagues but this is something I have developed myself in order to be part of a team.
Advisory teacher, authority A

A number of comments refer to the problems created by change:

I feel things have changed so much here that it is impossible to get a clear view on boxes which might be ticked. Whilst I still believe in the team concept, I feel we have all been thrown into the air and haven’t yet landed.
Senior adviser, authority D

Much is evolving at present and it is difficult to say that the response is positive ... but meetings and discussions indicate that much is coming to be clarified.
Adviser, authority D

The work of inspectors is changing so rapidly in response to external forces that team objectives, priorities and organisation are adjusting constantly to the extent that it is difficult to create a reflective, objective picture.
Inspector, authority D

There were a number of critical comments, mainly from advisory teachers:

I think this has changed for some advisory teachers i.e. those in the area development teams. Those who remain outside such teams tend to get information on a more or less hit and miss basis.
Advisory teacher, authority C

Since I am now seconded by the LEA to work with the — shire business partnership formed by the LEA and the TEC (Technical Education Council), I am increasingly distanced from the advisory team.
Advisory teachers, authority C

Advisory teachers are no longer located alongside advisers - in fact, we are based in separate buildings. This has done much to damage the sense of working in a team. We do, however, function very well as a smaller team of advisory teachers. This offers valuable mutual support in these changing and challenging times.
Advisory teacher, authority C
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The team is not in any corporate sense deciding its needs and cannot therefore support individual development although the majority are supportive people.

Inspector, authority D

Evidence from interviews

One hundred and forty comments were made which had a bearing on climate and culture.

Each of the 4 authorities had its own views about its culture and some of the quotations are therefore grouped according to the authority from which they came. Chief advisers had particular views, some of which were reflected in the views of their colleagues. These may go some way towards providing an explanation of the results of the questionnaires. The role of the leader, according to the literature quoted earlier in this chapter, would seem to be important in establishing team culture. (cf Beare et al, 1989, Whitaker, 1990b). Chief advisers were asked about their views and each section about an authority starts with contributions from them.

Authority A

Authority A scored well so far as the views of its inspectors were concerned but less well for advisory teachers. Comments support this. The chief adviser felt that there was a good team climate and this was borne out by the views of inspectors.

Q How far do you feel you work as a team? What sort of team climate do you think you’ve got?

A I think there’s quite a reasonable team climate. What I’m worried about in some ways is that it is going to get in the way of the difficulties we’ve got facing us in that people are so damn supportive of each other they lose their objectivity. They need to stand back a little, I think. I think I’ve got quite a good team climate. They are able to work together. What is interesting, is - you see it much more than in a large team - they are able to work together and work to different individuals as leaders.

Chief Inspector, authority A

Q I’d like to ask you what you feel the team climate is?

A A high degree of professionalism and of working with people who are highly competent and much valued in their efforts. That’s my sense about the team.

B Mine is that we’re very individualistic; that we’re allowed to be just that. There’s very competent control of quite a difficult team, because I think we all have different working practices, strengths and attitudes and we’re held together very amicably.

C And when you’re fed up you can come and put your head in a trolley and scream and nobody thinks there’s something odd about that!

Inspectors, authority A

In a way we don’t work with schools as a team, do we. We work as individuals with institutions but we work together as inspectors in a team.

Inspector, authority A
Coming into it later than anyone else in this room, I have felt a genuine warmth and also I've felt able to go to anyone who happens to be around and has two minutes and say, 'Help!' and receive it even on small issues which is the most important thing when you're first starting. It's the support beyond professionalism too.

*Inspector, authority A*

There's no doubt we are regarded as a team and particularly valued by people who aren't in the team, you know, other people in the directorate I think look upon this as quite a strong team. In some ways they find this slightly threatening because we are such a strong team. Nonetheless, that sort of recognition is definitely there.

*Inspector, authority A*

The chief inspector was conscious of the fact that the advisory teachers did not have the same team feeling as the inspectors:

I think they feel like advisory teachers everywhere - unloved, unwanted, pushed around. I think that's what they tend to feel, depending on the sort of relationships they have with their inspectors.

*Chief inspector, authority A*

Q Tell me what's wrong with the divisional days? (they had already been criticised)

A I think they reinforce the hierarchical structure of the division and don't really enable us to contribute effectively to the real job we're doing. The real decisions are taken elsewhere.

B That's right. I think it's to let the masses think they're actually decision making.

*Advisory teachers, authority A*

I mean one of the problems with divisional days is that it's often inappropriate for everyone to be going through the same experience on those days. I mean some people like to call it a team but operationally we're not a team. We are several teams.

*Advisory teacher, authority A*

One point worth mentioning here is also something about which many of us felt disgruntled some time ago, is that there was a time when we were able to meet as group of advisory teachers and we chaired our own meetings and reported back and that was squashed immediately and we were not allowed to. Almost as if we had no right to.

*Advisory teacher, authority A*

A We are a team, a self managing team. I don't feel we manage to be a team. We don't have a meeting. I mean I do think we need to have corporate objectives specially with hindsight.

B I don't think we could progress and stand as a body unless we have shared aims and objectives.

C As long as they are aims and objectives we have drawn up and not imposed.

*Advisory teachers authority A*

We 're a series of interlinked teams, of which the advisory service is one. We relate most strongly to specialists in our own subject areas in school. We might have a small group of advisory teachers who work rather more closely with us, either in relation to the same areas and I know some of us have another team of people who do identical work in other authorities. We have the opportunity to meet in different context from time to time and that's often useful as a communicating group because they're encountering very similar problems.

*Advisory teacher, authority A*
Authority B

Authority B advisers made very few comments which reflected on them as a team. Their scores in the questionnaires suggested that advisory teachers were a considerable strength in this authority. Unfortunately the distance travelled to this authority meant that the meeting with a group of advisory teachers was cut out of the programme on account of time. The problem was further compounded by the fact that so few advisory teachers returned the questionnaire. Discussion with the chief adviser suggested that there were various reasons for the strength of the advisory teacher force. They were all internal appointments of people who had already shown themselves able to work with other teachers. They had a careful induction and met regularly with a senior adviser. They were also tightly programmed by the advisers who met termly to decide what work each of the advisory teachers should do.

It could be that few comments about climate were made because authority B is the most established team having had few changes over a long period. They made only minor changes as a result of the Education Reform Act and the team had a great deal of stability. The chief adviser was well aware of the need to establish the right sort of climate.

Q What do you think are the most important things for you to do if you are to function effectively?

A You’ve got to feel the climate’s right. You’ve got to feel optimistic and positive and convince them to feel that they are valued.

Chief adviser, authority B

I hope people say that we are professional. I hope they feel we deal with things in a professional way. I hope people feel that there are systems and structures and a sense of direction and purpose and plans....I hope the culture is one in which they feel that there is a clear sense of direction and purpose.

Chief adviser, authority B

There was overall a sense of satisfaction among the advisers interviewed with the authority and the way their team worked:

I’m conscious of a commitment and a philosophy. I don’t feel that is because the team comes together or because it is managed but rather that it has its roots in a common desire to support teachers and help children to do their best work.

Adviser, authority B

This is my fourth authority and this is the only one where we have stand up discussion with the education officer and the deputy.

Adviser, authority B

Authority C

Authority C advisers had moved from being specialists to a situation where most of them had a general role as well. This had been quite traumatic and further changes were coming upon them before these changes had really settled down. In spite of these problems their scores for climate and culture were fairly good.
Q What do you think is the most important thing for you to do for the effectiveness of your team?

A I think the major responsibility is actually to be seen as having a vision and having some clarity, not about what we’re going to do exactly in the future, but to actually have a vision about the way we need to work in the future and the frameworks within which we can work.’

I feel my major job at the moment is to keep telling them it’s all right. To say, ’Look, we have got to change. These are the hard facts of life, but it’s going to be all right. We will get out the other side.’

Chief adviser, authority C

Q What sort of climate do you feel you have got as a team?

A It was very good and it certainly wasn’t very good when we were going through all the changes. The bitterness that some people felt they’d been duped into general advisory work and we had to work through that and going across phase was quite a sticky moment.

Chief adviser, authority C

‘We do pull as a team. People are working much more now in teams and people are much more willing to chip in. There are less prima donnas.

Chief adviser, authority C

The views of advisers appeared to reflect the uncertainties which they had experienced and the stage they had now reached. There appeared to be some good team work building up in the area and other small teams but less feeling of being part of a larger team.

‘I feel very strongly about area teams. I think it’s one of my main forms of support, the other one being the bay I happen to sit at County Hall. It’s a group of people whom I feel I know fairly well and hopefully know me fairly well and it’s a very strong support structure. We’ve gone through some steamy times over the last few years with agreements, disagreements, lots of angst, lots of angry meetings and I think we’ve come out stronger as a result of it.

Adviser, authority C

I feel a team culture in terms of the area team. I’m not convinced - I haven’t sampled the same feeling in a wider context to a certain extent. I mean that’s probably a lot to do with the fact that I’ve been incredibly busy and we’ve only been together as a whole group on a couple of occasions since I’ve been here. The situation may change so I’m ready to couch what I’m saying carefully in terms of a limited experience of a new culture.

Adviser, authority C

I think the advisory and inspection team works developing a team approach, as have some of the area teams and as have some of the curriculum teams ... but I’m not sure whether there is a feeling that all those other teams are part of a service which is driving forward in a coherent way, but I think as an advisory and inspection team we are getting some where near it.

Adviser, authority C

Building up a contribution from everyone - it’s very difficult to do when you’re largely working on your own as a general adviser and if you’re not careful, largely being reactive to school things. I mean, you need to have some vision of where you’re going with the group and to be a bit more creative, a bit more proactive.

Adviser, authority C

You know we all do the bits and pieces and managers might do what they think best but we certainly don’t talk to each other about sharing ideas and therefore developing some agreement that we all do it this way and have a consistent approach.

Adviser, authority C
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Advisory teachers reflect much the same view, with enthusiasm for being part of a small team. Some of the advisory teachers in this authority were grouped in areas with the brief to support the schools in that area.

‘There seems to be a difference ... between people who are part of a team and have some sort of access to the management system and people like J who tends to be on her own and therefore much more isolated. I mean, I think the team, certainly the people on my team have felt a great benefit from being part of a team where the issues are shared and support is given.’

Advisory teacher, authority C

Authority D

Authority D had also gone through a trauma of changing to separated advice and inspection. They had the additional problem of maintaining a feeling of being one team in a situation where there were two teams separately led concerned with different aspects of the work.

Q What do you think are the most important things for you to do personally to have the team functioning effectively?

A I think listening. That they see I’ve got no axe to grind in one sense and they know I’ve come up through the system. They know they can talk to me about their work and problems that they’ve got and I can empathise with it.

Assistant Chief Education Officer, Head of Inspection, Advice and Support Services Branch, authority D

Q How far do you feel you are a whole team and not 2 separate teams?

A ‘I think we have a very good climate with no separation at all. Clearly in the early days when the teams started to meet separately they were wondering what they were talking about, but this was overcome and there is great respect for everybody in the team. I mean, clearly all teams have their strengths and weaknesses but as individuals people respect each other a great deal.

Assistant Chief Education Officer, Head of Inspection, Advice and Support Services Branch, authority D

I suppose I see my role as trying to ensure that sort of framework, that organisational framework allows people to feel hopefully, to give them some purpose and direction about what we’re seeking to do.

Principal adviser, authority D

I think we’re a highly moral group of people. But in terms of their enthusiasm for the inspection process, I don’t think we’ve ever felt more sure of what we are doing, but also we’ve never been in a position where we feel that the service we offer is so misunderstood and under-rated by people out there.

Principal inspector, authority D

The comments of advisers and inspectors reflect some of the problems they have experienced in dividing their work:

‘I think we’ve come together too late as a full team to really have felt part of all the thinking that went into it and we’ve each had to come to terms with an existing structure into which we’ve had to fit and that’s really determined the way in which we’ve worked. It’s not really been possible to be in a position to have influenced the thinking very much.

Adviser, authority D
Changing culture. I think we're getting more programmed and that's something I welcome. I think you can programme and still be flexible, if you know what I mean.

*Inspector, authority D*

We go back to the beginning where they talked about the decision to separate advice and support and yet what I observe has been happening over the past 9 months, has been a desperate attempt to hold the whole department together, not even just the branch which deals with advice and support, but the whole education department. ... A lot of our time has been taken up with informing each other and trying to create a corporate understanding of what's happening right across the education department. It does create a conflict. You know the desperate need to find quality time to get to grips with all the inspection implications for the future and we haven't been particularly successful in doing that.

*Inspector, authority D*

The climate and culture in our service now is some 400% better than it was some years ago. There is a lot of mutual trust between colleagues, mutual respect but fewer cowboys and cowgirls doing their own thing, fighting for money, being empire builders, team culture's much better.

*Inspector, authority D*

'I was only going to speculate that I think controversially that we've been rapidly moved to a situation where the inspection service in (this authority) actually loosens a lot of those ties with the education department and it will sink or swim on our ability.

*Inspector, authority D*

Advisory teachers in this authority seemed to enjoy their work and to gain from being part of small teams.

I think most of us sitting round the table feel very much part of individual teams and I certainly feel this, that we're not sort of a one little part of a whole team. I think we work very much independently and not in teams, which is not to say, ... that we can't actually work with colleagues from other teams.

*Advisory teacher, authority D*

I think when you've been with an authority for a long time you get to know the faces and the people and so I actually feel very, very much a part of inspection, advice and support service. I think it's also partly the nature of me because I like to think I'm a sociable soul and I go and talk to people and also I go along to bun fights and things like that and I think that people who play together can often work together more effectively. It works for me.

*Advisory teacher, authority D*

Just what a super job it is. ... I think it's just the best job there ever is ... because we get the feedback because we get people saying 'You know this is good'. I mean, who's going to go up to an inspector and say 'Gosh, you did a good job there'. They just don't, but we get all this and because of this we put up with insecurity, we put up with long hours and we put up with all the effort that goes into it and also because it's a very creative job, because we work in classrooms and we're teachers but we don't have the sort of daily grind of all the marking and other admin hassle. We can come out and be creative.

*Advisory teacher, authority D*

Advisory teachers

There were many problems facing the advisory teachers interviewed. In particular their future was uncertain and this was a matter for concern for them. There was also a feeling that they might be part of smaller teams but were not really part of the main advisory team. In addition their status tended to be uncertain.
I've been an advisory teacher for 8 years. I know exactly what I want to do and where I want my career to go. But there isn't a way. I've got a contract for another 12 months and after that I mightn't have a job. *Advisory teacher, authority D*

'I see this (funding) as being one of the biggest drawbacks to being an advisory teacher, because you have your post for a year. You don't know if it will be funded the following year. You build up a relationship with schools. you get projects under way. You know, you really get involved and it just goes. Somebody else comes along. It takes them a term to pick up the pieces and I think it's really a barrier to effectiveness. *Advisory teacher, authority D*

'If you look at the amount of time it takes actually to train people who come into the job before they can be any good, how much use can you be in a year if you're going to be going back into school. One the other hand, if you've actually done this job for a large number of years, there isn't a route back into schools either, so that is the other concern.

My other concern is working with members of the team to actually hold a team together when people are always looking over their shoulders and saying "We need a job, we need the cash in six months' time. What guarantees have we got that we can have it." This makes the team very insecure. It makes everything very jumpy and you don't actually work well if you have people within the team who are constantly saying things like this. *Advisory teacher, authority D*

I think the policy to preserve people's jobs by not replacing other people's jobs when you leave, which is a very sound personnel issue, is leaving us with a very skewed service. I think if we are a team, then some hard decisions have got to be made soon about that, possibly knocking some people out to get the balance back. *Advisory teacher, authority A*

I've always found ignorance in the schools or confusion about the titles inspector, adviser or advisory teacher and we're forever getting mail from headteachers referring to us as inspectors or advisers or advisory teachers. There is a lot of confusion about this nomenclature that exists. *Advisory teacher, authority A*

*What creates culture and climate?*

A number of people touched on what contributed to culture and climate. Leadership was recognised as one of the ways in which culture was developed. The importance of being able to have informal relationships as a means of working together was stressed by one respondent. It was also a matter of sharing common aims and purposes.

Well, what you're talking about here is identifying the positive culture within a team, aren't you and trying identify what makes a particular team jell or work. I think it's getting your finger on that, the culture itself and what goes to make the culture. You can read all the books on organisation and organisational development and all the rest of it but what actually makes a culture be that way? I mean, I agree with you, you can take positive steps. An effective manager can take positive steps to create a culture and climate. *Advisory teacher, authority D*

If you have a manager who has the capability of creating and maintaining this positive climate, this ethos, within which, if conflict is arising, it can be drawn out and faced in a sensitive and supportive way. I mean, I've been involved in teams where this has happened and its magic. *Advisory teacher, authority D*
Originally many of us were based at County Hall in advisory alongside our advisers and so we had that informal day-to-day and they would pass a paper across the desk or whatever and ask your opinion and be much more closely involved... Then a number of us moved here and we actually had an informal contact with other colleagues in other areas. So what had been a slightly incestuous sort of situation with your own adviser was now broadening and in fact some of the most... stimulating encounters are actually by the photocopier or whatever. But that's the sort of encounter that has been super and from that (have come) some very interesting developments. In our room we have special needs, we have health and HIV Aids, we have environmental studies, dental health and we've actually found that we worked that into a project. It wasn't planned but simply because we were housed in the same room.

Advisory teacher, authority C

The one issue for me is the whole issue about how much of a team the advisers see themselves as and not just heads, these colleagues who are heads of teams. They have their own focus for their work but I sometimes wonder to what extent we deliberately and consciously are trying to make an issue of the advisers as a team sharing a common philosophy and a common approach to things and I suppose that's a pretty difficult task to do with any body of people who come from different backgrounds and have different strengths and interests.

Adviser, authority D

Change

Advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers were being asked to make considerable changes in the way they worked. This involved a change in the culture as well as changes in practices.

You ask a difficult question about culture at a time when we're being told quite specifically that we must change culture in the sense of the way we think, feel and act. As with any group of people, staff anywhere, you would find a lot of things that are held in common, some of which would correspond to the aims and principles which they've laid down and others less so, so you'd have a range of ways that people think, feel and act and to be told to change the way you think, feel and act is an interesting proposition.

Adviser, authority C

I think there are great dangers ahead which could separate not only inspectors and advisers but within an education department as such and it really is a challenge we have to face. One of the strengths of the service is its flexibility because of its ability to be an integrated service, a clear range of specialist advice, but if those specialists aren't working collectively then you undermine the corporate value of the group.

Principal adviser, authority D

The reorganisation was a very traumatic experience for everybody. We also had to move site, so that we had to come here and we were bringing together people who'd been in 4 different locations with their various support services, so we had 4 groups coming together who'd worked in different ways, had different procedures in a structure which many advisers and inspectors were suspicious about.

Assistant Chief Education Officer, Head of Inspection, Advice and Support Services Branch, authority D

Summary

Findings in relation to the questions asked

1 Advisers and inspectors tended to feel themselves part of an overall team culture but were often members of smaller teams which they valued for the support and opportunities to work together which they offered. Advisory teachers tended to see themselves as part of smaller teams in most cases and not fully part of the main advisory service. Some advisory teachers were isolated and not part of any team.
Climate and culture was positively associated with advice and support at a level only between 5% and 10% which is not significant. Teacher development was significantly correlated at the 1% level. It was not possible to correlate climate and culture with inspection because the sample was too small.

Other findings

1. People found support in being part of team. Small teams appeared to offer more support than large ones. This suggests that large teams need to be a collection of small teams, each with a measure of autonomy and opportunity to make decisions about some area of their work, but working together.

2. There was a feeling on the part of advisers and advisory teachers that there should be a common culture of aims and purposes behind the work of an advisory team.

3. The development of a common culture and the opportunity to work together was helped when people worked in the same overall environment.

4. Chief advisers tended to see their role as providing vision and direction and an organisational framework. The role of leaders was seen as important in creating a culture.

5. The position of advisory teachers tended to be anomalous. They were not always seen as part of the overall advisory team. Some worked happily in small teams. Others were to some extent isolated. There were problems about their secondment and return to schools and at present their posts have an uncertain future. This made planning and organising difficult. Schools were not always clear about their role, but, as we have already seen, in virtually every area discussed, their work tends to be more highly valued by teachers, though not headteachers, than that of advisers.
15 THE ORGANISATION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE ADVISORY TEAM

Introduction

Advisory teams are organised in various ways. Some have divided specialist and general work. Others are now dividing inspection and advice and this will be the normal division in the future since the 1992 Education (Schools) Act does not allow the same person both to advise and inspect a school. Some work as one team from a central office. Others divide the authority into areas with individuals or small teams responsible for the schools in a given area.

Relevant literature

The Audit Commission (1989, p.1) found that ‘advisory work is not as positively managed as it needs to be’ and the survey of advisory teams by Dean (1991b) suggested that there had been a good deal of movement towards more positive management immediately following the publication of the Education Reform Act in 1988 with the establishment of chief adviser posts in all authorities and creation of middle management posts in many.

The Audit Commission (1989, p.24) noted that the cost of the advisory service nationally at that time was £8.05 per pupil. The Commission made the point that staffing of the advisory service should be linked as rigorously as possible to the tasks to be carried out.

The statement of expectation should include outline quantifications of how frequently and intensively teaching and learning in different institutions are to be observed, what level of effort should be devoted to planning of INSET, what sort of time allowance should be set aside for counselling teachers.

They suggested that the specialisms needed should include management in all three phases - primary, secondary and further education, teaching styles and methods for early years, infants and junior years, work in the primary phases on number, language, science and humanities, all the subjects of the National Curriculum religious education, special educational needs and cross curricular themes such as multi-cultural education.

The national survey in this study (chapter 5) suggests that a large number of authorities would no longer be able to make this kind of provision in September 1993.

Bolam et al (1978) found that advisory teams varied considerably in size and staffing. The criteria for deciding the staffing of advisory teams was unclear, sometimes depending on the size of the authority, the school population, adequate coverage of subjects and other specialisms and the size of teams known to be effective. Fifty four per cent of respondents said they had a general advisory role with a group of schools but in nearly every case this was
combined with a specialist responsibility. Seventy per cent had a subject specialism. Of these, 70% of all curriculum specialists had a single subject, 24% had two subjects and 7% had three. Twenty-four per cent of the total sample had responsibility for an age range, mainly first, infant, junior or primary. The two largest groups of non-curriculum specialists were in-service education and audio visual aids.

There were three types of team. The first type was chief adviser plus team in which most people had subject specialisms with the occasional phase adviser. The second type was one in which the total area was divided into districts with an adviser responsible for each district, each having also a specialism. The third pattern was one in which there were a number of senior staff who coordinated work. Sometimes these were phase advisers, sometimes district and sometimes subject.

The Society of Education Officers (SEO) and the National Association of Inspectors and Educational Advisers (NAIEA) (1979, p.2) published a joint paper on the role of the adviser. It contained this statement:

If the advisory service is to function effectively, it is essential that each educational establishment is known as a whole and known well by at least one adviser, who should be expected to have first-hand and up-to-date knowledge of its curriculum and organisation, to know the quality of the individual teachers within it and its relationship with other institutions in the community.

This point was repeated in an unpublished DES paper (1985) on the role of the adviser. All four of the authorities in this study had advisers in this role but the national survey suggested that although it will still be important for LEAs to know individual schools it was unlikely that any LEA would be able to support a large enough team for schools to be known in this way.

Wilkins (1985) argued for an advisory service which involved generalists who had held institutional responsibility at headship or possibly deputy headship level and seconded curriculum development advisers, perhaps seconded for 3 years. He suggested that the skills and previous experience needed for these two roles were different and that the needs of schools might be better met if they were provided separately.

Maychell and Keys (1993, p.34) found that most (92%) of the LEAs replying to their questionnaire had a link adviser scheme of some kind. Around 95% of headteachers said they had a link adviser and about three quarters said that they preferred this system. Secondary schools had more visits from their link advisers during the period studied (Autumn 1990 to Spring 1992) with 70% of secondary schools receiving more than 6 visits during this period. One headteacher commented on the diminishing amount of adviser support:

It has changed a lot in the last five years. It used to be a role where the (link) adviser had a very clear picture of the school, was more familiar with the life of the school, knew members of staff and what was going on. That isn’t the case now; that has gone.
Hand (1981, pp.70,112) suggested that if good knowledge of individual schools is to be a possibility, an area organisation is helpful:

If organisation is on an area basis, each adviser is responsible for a relatively small number of schools which he (sic) can get to know well. This puts him in a good position to become involved in school based work but he cannot offer specific subject advice to every department.

If you work in an LEA that has an area structure for the advisory team your school is more likely to receive a pastoral visit than it would if it were in an LEA that placed its emphasis on the specialist role.

He went on to point out the difficulty of specialist advisers becoming generalists.

Can you reasonably expect specialist advisers to turn into general advisers? What happens to the specialist role which they hitherto fulfilled? If an LEA doesn't have area advisers or advisers with general responsibilities, how does it really know its schools?

This problem was highlighted in a number of cases in the study in authority C where the general adviser role was fairly new. The second part of this chapter gives a number of examples of comments about this.

Collier (1977, p.18) wrote of the role of the general adviser. Although this is a long time ago, what he has to say is still very relevant and links up with the many comments made by teachers in this study about the credibility of advisers.

Most teachers will listen to a specialist whose training and experience parallel their own. They will accept one who has successfully carried high responsibility of a wider kind in school. They equally, perhaps too readily, reject the adviser who appears to be straying outside his experience. The secondary specialist, for instance, who dilates on aspects of primary education may be wise and shrewd and having done his homework may be able to offer soundly-based advice. His initial handicap, however, is far too crippling. The fault lies partly with the attitudes of the teachers but it would be foolish not to recognise that these attitudes are based on a genuine feeling that advice needs to be based on experience.

This has become evident many times in this study.

Donoughue (1981, p.69) pointed out that there are also problems in a specialist advisory team. These were also highlighted in authority D which had this form of organisation as well having some specialists turned generalists.

If an advisory team is organised so that advisers are principally subject specialists, then there are serious problems about the amount of contact one adviser can have with several 100 schools. Subject advisers make contact through short courses.

Maychell and Keys (1993, p.37,38) also asked respondents questions about the separation of inspection and advice. The vast majority (85%) thought that the same people should provide both. Only 8 respondents thought that separating advice and inspection was the best way of organising the service. A senior education officer made the following comment:
What is the purpose of inspecting? To improve practice. The only way to do this is to be involved with schools in development planning. Advisers who have not been involved cannot do this. Inspection and advice are part of a continuum - they cannot be separated.

By contrast a chief adviser in an authority where the two functions were separated commented as follows:

If you are inspecting and advising at the same time there is a conflict of roles, because you are often inspecting your own prejudices ..., whereas if I am advising on such and such a method and someone else comes to inspect, they can be totally objective in their judgements rather than partial.

This would seem to be a somewhat doubtful premise, since the person coming to inspect may have another set of prejudices.

They found most headteachers preferred the combined role and quote two headteachers as follows:

Inspection should be carried out by someone who knows the school setting and circumstances. A general adviser is best placed to make informed judgements about the school and its work.

Inspection is seen as slightly less threatening when carried out by people we know and trust and more importantly, who know and understand the problems and difficulties we experience in our particular situations.

About a quarter of headteachers favoured separate advisory and inspection teams. They felt that the relationship with advisers should be different from that with inspectors. Some felt they would not be able to trust an adviser who might sometimes be an inspector and that it was confusing not to know which hat the person coming into the school was wearing.

Lowe (1992, p.49) compared the combining of inspection and advice with the way a teacher worked in the classroom, using formative assessment of children's needs and then providing for them. She made the following point:

The developmental inspector is in constant dialogue with personnel during and following the audit, giving advice on design and development while engaged in the cyclical evaluation process. (Lowe's italics.)

Stillman and Grant (1989, p.195) listed comments from advisers about the specialist/general division:

- it frustrates internal promotion seeking general experience;
- it frustrates promotion outside the authority;
- it creates a 'door-to-door salesman' impression of subject advisers in schools/institutions;
- it creates salary divisions - resentments within the team;
- it accords seniority to phase advisers;
- it depresses the salary for new subject advisers;
- it creates paperwork, preferential treatment and prevents scrutiny of, and team involvement in, the advice given directly by general advisers to senior administrative officers and to institutions.
Bolam (1979, p.41) argued for a rational staffing of advisory services. He suggested the following:

We may reasonably argue that each adviser needs to make at least one contact per term of, say, one hour, with each teacher for whom he (sic) has a responsibility. If we further assume that in a school year of about 40 weeks, an adviser should spend half his time on such contacts with teachers, then each adviser would have approximately 100 days available. If we further assume that the urban adviser can make approximately four and a half visits or contacts a day this argues that he should have a maximum loading of about 150 teachers. The equivalent calculation for a rural adviser leads to the conclusion that he should have a 100 teacher loading.

There is a great deal of evidence that leadership makes a difference to the effectiveness of a team (e.g. Purkey and Smith (1985), Bruss 1986), Reid et al (1987), Mortimore et al (1988). Both Stillman and Grant (1989) and the Audit Commission (1989, p.31) noted that the place of the advisory service in the LEA was determined to a great extent by the role of the head of the service, whose tasks the Audit Commission suggested were to:

- ensure coherence in the work of the team and allocate specific curricular and geographical responsibilities;
- establish the process of decision-making and help the team to determine its goals, priorities and policies;
- monitor the implementation of agreed policies and evaluate the effectiveness of the work of the team;
- ensure that there are effective channels of communication both within the advisory service and with other groups.

Dean (1984, p.5) suggested questions for judging the effectiveness of a chief adviser in managing his (sic) team:

a) To what extent does the advisory team operate as a team?
b) What scope is there for individual members to exercise initiative?
c) How far is there consistency of approach to advisory tasks by different members of the team?
d) How effective is communication within the advisory service and with other sections of the Education department and other institutions?
e) Is there a proper balance between the scope offered for using individual gifts and talents and the tasks to be undertaken?
f) How good is the morale of the team?

Briault (1976) in a lecture to chief advisers suggested that one of the most important aspects of the chief advisers’ role was his or her ability to see the totality of the service. This was something unique to this role and that of the chief education officer.

Stillman and Grant (1989) were critical of the fact that, at the time of their study, in a number of authorities the leadership of the advisory team was not taken sufficiently seriously. In some cases there was no chief adviser. In other cases the chief adviser’s role was undertaken by the deputy chief education officer or an assistant education officer or there was a chief adviser, but he or she was expected to undertake duties not connected with the leadership of the advisory team.
The Audit Commission report (1989, p.1) found that 'advisory work is not as positively managed as it needs to be.'

Dean (1991b) in a national survey of advisory teams found that this situation had changed, partly as a result of the 1988 Education Reform Act and probably partly as a result of the studies by Grant and Stillman and the Audit Commission. Ninety six authorities replied to this survey (86%) and all of these had a chief adviser and 65% of them were at the second tier level in their authorities.

The authorities studied and internal papers from other authorities also suggest that LEA advisory teams now appeared to be more tightly managed and many now have computer records which give a good deal of information. For example all four authorities in this study had computer records and authority B in particular had a comprehensive computer record of all advisory activities which not only gave detailed information about how each adviser was spending his or her time, but also the cost of this. In addition it gave detailed information and judgments about every school in the borough.

An internal survey for SCIA (Society of Chief Inspectors and Advisers) of 30 teams (Dean 1990) covering county and borough authorities showed that almost all had appointed people to middle management posts in the advisory service.

Jones (1988,p.6) described a project team of advisory teachers and lists the criteria by which they were appointed:

They are above average classroom practitioners; have their ability to influence colleagues; they have knowledge and experience of teaching in more than one school; they have a 'good' INSET attendance record; have worked with adults and appreciate the fact that working in this way requires different skills from 'normal' teaching; they are adaptable; they demonstrate initiative, creativity and imagination; and have sufficient expertise and experience to earn respect, and to be respected, in the role of support teacher.

The advisory teachers studied by Harland (1990) found that the overall environment of the school was important as well as the attitudes of individual teachers in making effective advisory work possible.

Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991, p.47) noted that 'the uniqueness of the individual setting is a critical factor in whether change works or not'

Sullivan (1987, p.11) noted that 'There was a small minority of schools where relationships between staff members were strained and in some cases openly hostile. In such circumstances there was always the danger of being sucked into the whirlpool of internal school politics and feuding.' He also comments on the fact that in most staffrooms there are the opinion makers:
There were usually one or two people on each staff that exerted a strong influence on the ethos and working practices of the school. The natural leaders were not always those who held the higher positions in the management structure of the school and could include the school secretary and ancillary assistants. The natural leaders were the keys to making an involvement a success or reducing it to a dismal failure. Winning friends and influencing people were prime tasks.

Small (1982, p.20) noted that advisers needed good clerical backup since they were field officers and out of the office for a good deal of the time. He pointed out that in practice ‘most rely on the exigencies of the typing pool, usually with a clerk to 8 or more advisers.’

This point was also made by the Audit Commission who suggested that approximately 10 hours a week of clerical support per member was about what was needed.

The situation appears to be rather better now in general terms but individual members in the authorities studied complained of inadequate support.

The situation in the 4 authorities

The overall organisation in the 4 authorities has already been described in chapter 6.

In authority A the team supported two senior posts for primary and secondary education respectively. Both of these were coordinating roles. These were a fairly recent innovation and there was a certain amount of uncertainty about the need for the posts within the team and some feeling that their existence involved demotion for other members. The chief adviser felt she needed to identify the responsibilities rather more clearly.

There were objectives and priorities agreed by the whole team of inspectors who then set out their own objectives and priorities in the light of the team objectives and priorities. These were then all brought together in one document so that everyone was aware of the team’s plans for the year. Advisory teachers were only involved in this process through the inspectors to whom they were responsible. The low numbers in the inspectorate meant that advisory teachers had an enhanced role in some cases, for example, there was no inspector for modern languages and the advisory teacher had a very similar role to an inspector because of this. Advisory teachers were not regarded as an integral part of the the overall advisory service As a result they felt that they were not sufficiently involved in the planning process.

There were two main ways in which work was evaluated. Records of visits were kept on computer and the chief inspector was given regular printouts. She looked at various aspects of the records, such as the number of visits different schools had had. She also visited schools on a regular programme and discussed with the headteacher the reactions of the head and staff to the visits of inspectors and advisory teachers.

The team met regularly each fortnight and there were regular full day meetings for all members of the education department including advisory teachers.
The chief adviser was also in effect the deputy director so that she spent a good deal of
time on general departmental issues including time with members. She thought she spent
about a third of her time with the inspectorate team.

In authority B there were 3 senior advisers, each with responsibility for an area team
in a part of the authority. Each had 3 primary advisers in his team who had general
responsibility for the primary schools. Secondary schools each had their own general adviser.

The whole team met fortnightly for general discussions and had an annual planning
cycle for all their major activities. Sometimes the whole team was involved in planning but
there was also use of task groups and some planning was done by the senior team. These
groups produced draft plans which were then discussed by the whole team. Advisory teachers
had very little involvement in planning. Their work was directed by advisers who decided
what the advisory teachers should do. They were not regarded as an integral part of the
advisory service.

The major evaluation in authority B came from the computer record of visits which
were issued to advisers monthly and considered by the chief adviser. There was also
discussion about the annual programme and the team was now putting together their findings
about their work as an annual report to the Education Committee.

The chief adviser felt that he spent a lot of time in administration and meetings and about
a quarter of his time with advisory colleagues. He was conscious that he did not get into
schools very much.

In authority C there was a senior team of six county advisers which met weekly. Three
of these county advisers led an area team with another county adviser as deputy. Those who
were deputies had other responsibilities and each county adviser had phase responsibilities.
Planning was partly a responsibility of the senior management team who spent 3 days each
term on this. There was then a full day of planning for everyone at the beginning and end of
each term. Advisory teachers felt they had some say in planning through their line managers
but this varied from one person to another. There was an interesting organisation in which
advisory teachers were appointed to an area by the headteachers in that area and were there
to provide the service the schools required. This appeared to headteachers and to the advisory
teachers concerned to work well. Advisory teachers were not seen as an integral part of the
advisory service.

Not a lot of information was collected about evaluation for this authority. The success
of INSET was evaluated partly through questionnaires. Information was collected about
visits and kept on computer and analysed from time to time.

The chief adviser primarily saw her role as far as the inspection and advisory service
as being the link between the branch and the education department with the senior manage-
ment team managing the service. She felt she held the responsibility for policy developmen.
In authority D there was a principal inspector and principal adviser reporting to the assistant chief education officer and head of the inspection, advice and support service. Each principal was responsible for the running of his part of the service. There were 2 senior inspectors with responsibility for secondary and middle schools respectively and 3 senior advisers each with responsibility for a curriculum centre and at least one other major area of work. There was a variety of meetings for different groups but one of the main types of meeting was that of the networks which were centred on the 3 areas of the county. These involved advisory teachers who were seen as an integral part of the networks.

Planning on the advisory side was done by the principal adviser and the 3 senior advisers who had different particular briefs and by the principal inspector and senior inspectors for the inspections. There was a branch management team which met weekly to handle any details which came up. There was also an executive made up of the senior inspectors/advisers, principal inspector/principal adviser and this met once a month, often for a whole day to do in depth, more strategic planning.

Overall planning of inspection involved the Education Department as well as the inspectorate. There was planning on the advisory side at team level, at network and at whole support service level. There were development plans which were service development plans, team development plans and personal development plans and they looked at setting priorities and goals at those 3 levels.

The whole inspectorate had been involved in writing the paper on the processes of inspection and it was monitored by a user group. All service areas had user groups which fed back information from headteacher meetings as well as from members of the group. An executive committee consisting of the principal and senior inspectors and advisers met monthly to plan. There had been some external evaluation of the work of the team. There was also an annual report to the chief education officer which was mainly quantitative and based on a computer record. They were also looking at qualitative measures.

The assistant chief education officer and head of inspection, advice and support service branch, handled things with committee, interfacing with politicians. He felt his task was mainly that of representing the branch, trying to coordinate things, handling day-to-day crises with the committee.

The questionnaire survey

This chapter addresses the following questions:

1. How do advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers view the organisation and management of their teams?
2 Is there a relationship between these views and those held of the work of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers in the key areas of advice and support and teacher development?

This section deals with those items in the set of criteria on culture, organisation and management which were not dealt with in the previous chapter. The problem described there about the lack of information from advisory teachers obtains here also.

Advisers' views about the organisation and management of their teams
Advisers were asked whether they agreed, were neutral or disagreed with a series of statements about the organisation and management of their teams. There were a number of high scores with 20 (44%) of scores in the 'good' category including 2 scores of 3.00. However there were also 6 scores (13%) in the 'poor' category. The scores can be seen in summary in the graphs on the next page and on the fold out table on page 318. The average scores were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.47 for advisers 2.28 for inspectors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADVISERS' AND INSPECTORS' VIEWS OF 
THE ORGANISATION AND MANAGEMENT OF 
THE ADVISORY TEAM

Fig. 15.1

G2 I am involved in team planning
G3 I know our team objectives
G4 I plan with team objectives in mind
G5 I know the team priorities
G6 I make decisions about my priorities in the light of team priorities
G13 We have a clear management organisation
G14 Our management organisation works well
G15 We spend time as a team on our professional development
G16 The team supports my own development
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Authority A had good scores for every item and scores of 3.00 for 2 items. They also had the highest score for every item. Authority B had 2 good scores. Authority C had the lowest score for every item and 4 scores below 2.00. Authority D advisers had 6 good scores and authority D inspectors had 3 good scores and one poor score.

Authority A had scores of 3.00 for ‘I know our team objectives’ and ‘We spend time as a team on our professional development.’ Their lowest scores were for ‘The team supports my own development’ (2.67) and ‘I am involved in team planning’ (2.67).

Authority B’s highest scores were for ‘We have a clear management organisation’ (2.82) and ‘Our management organisation works well’ (2.73). Their lowest score was for ‘I plan with team objectives in mind’ (2.09).

Authority C’s highest score was for ‘I am involved in team planning’ (2.42) and their lowest score was for ‘Our management organisation works well.’ (1.48).

Authority D’s advisers’ highest score was for ‘I plan with team objectives in mind’ (2.87) and their lowest score was for ‘Our management organisation works well’ (1.87). The inspectors’ highest score was for ‘I am involved in team planning’ (2.64) and the lowest score was for ‘Our management organisation works well’ (1.86).

No items had good scores throughout and there was a marked difference in the scores for ‘We have a clear management organisation’ and ‘Our management organisation works well’ between authority A which had good scores for these items for advisers and authority C where 4 of the six scores were below 2.00.

Advisory teachers views of management and organisation

As was noted previously, the scores for authorities B and D for advisory teachers were artificially high because of the very small numbers replying. Average scores were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADVISORY TEACHERS' VIEWS OF THE ORGANISATION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE ADVISORY TEAM

Fig. 15.2

G2 I am involved in team planning
G3 I know our team objectives
G4 I plan with team objectives in mind
G5 I know the team priorities
G6 I make decisions about my priorities in the light of team priorities
G13 We have a clear management organisation
G14 Our management organisation works well
G15 We spend time as a team on our professional development
G16 The team supports my own development
Authority A had 4 good scores and one poor score and they had two of the lowest scores. Authority B had the highest scores throughout with all good scores and five scores of 3.00. Authority C had no good scores and had the lowest scores for all but 2 items. Authority D had good scores throughout and 3 scores of 3.00.

Authority A’s highest scores were for ‘I am involved in team planning’ (2.71) and ‘I plan with team objectives in mind’ (2.71). Their lowest score score was for ‘We spend time as a team on our professional development’ (1.94).

Authority B had scores of 3.00 for ‘I am involved in team planning’, ‘I know our team objectives’, ‘I make decisions about my priorities in the light of team priorities’ and ‘We spend time as a team on our professional development’. Their lowest scores, which are still very good scores, were for ‘I plan with team objectives in mind’ (2.75), ‘We have a clear management organisation’ (2.75), ‘Our management organisation works well’ (2.75) and ‘The team supports my own professional development’ (2.75).

Authority C’s highest score was for ‘I am involved in team planning’ (2.43) and their lowest score was for ‘Our management organisation works well’ (2.04).

Authority D had scores of 3.00 for ‘I am involved in team planning’, ‘I know the team priorities’ and ‘I make decisions about my priorities in the light of team priorities’. Their lowest scores were for ‘Our management organisation works well’ (2.50) and ‘We spend time as a team on our professional development’ (2.50).

No item had good scores throughout. Authorities B and D had higher scores than authorities A and C for every item.

**Overall view of scores for organisation and management**

No item had good scores throughout, but ‘I am involved in team planning’, ‘I know our team objectives’ and ‘I plan with team objectives in mind’ each had 6 good scores out of a possible 9. The weakest item was ‘Our management organisation works well’ with 4 good scores and 3 poor scores.

**Comparison of organisation scores with those for key areas**

Scores were correlated with those for headteachers and teachers separately for advice and support and for in-service education. The correlations for advice and support for both headteachers and teachers were not significant, nor were the correlations for headteachers for teacher development. However, the correlation for headteachers for teacher development was at a level between 5% and 10%.
### TABLE OF SCORES FOR MANAGEMENT AND ORGANISATION

**Fig. 15.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority A</th>
<th>Authority B</th>
<th>Authority C</th>
<th>Authority D Advisers</th>
<th>Authority D Inspectors</th>
<th>Authority A</th>
<th>Authority B</th>
<th>Authority C</th>
<th>Authority D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority D Advisers</th>
<th>Authority D Inspectors</th>
<th>Authority A</th>
<th>Authority B</th>
<th>Authority C</th>
<th>Authority D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores in this table are the average scores per item.
- **Bold type**: The highest score for that item in the questionnaire.
- **Italic**: The lowest score for that item in the questionnaire.
- **Underlined**: Scores over 2.50.
- **Scores below 2.00**: Surrounding rectangle.

- **G2**: I am involved in team planning
- **G3**: I know our team objectives
- **G4**: I plan with team objectives in mind
- **G5**: I know the team priorities
- **G6**: I make decisions about my priorities in the light of team priorities
- **G13**: We have a clear management organisation
- **G14**: Our management organisation works well
- **G15**: We spend time as a team on our professional development
- **G16**: The team supports my own development
Comments on questionnaires
There were 6 comments about organisation and management on the questionnaires. They all came from authorities C and D and tended to be critical. The following comprise the total list:

As an advisory teacher I often felt that the LEA management/advisory service management did not recognise advisory teachers as members of the advisory service. Information frequently reached schools before us - a lack of consultation about changes directly affecting us - no training or professional development with advisers.
Advisory teacher, authority C

As an advisory teacher new to the authority it was very difficult to pick up the relationships/positions between general advisers, county advisers etc. and difficult to understand the LEA ethos.
Advisory teacher, authority C

Fairly hierarchical and patriarchal management structures. We need a radical re-think in order to work genuinely as a team. The present climate does not make this easy.
Inspector, authority D

Role of senior inspector/adviser needs developing.
Inspector, authority D

‘Opportunities do arise to plan and prioritise in the team, but many of us are too busy with day-to-day matters that such decisions get left to senior colleagues.
Inspector, authority D

There is sometimes frustration among colleagues in the service that a tremendous amount of expertise within an inspection service is not always used to its full potential.
Inspector, authority D

Evidence from interviews
A hundred and sixty four points were made about organisation and management were made in the interviews. Of these, 30 were made by headteachers and 134 by advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers. Thirty six were made by people from authority A, 9 from authority B, 33 from authority C and 66 from authority D.

The comments of headteachers, advisers and advisory teachers on the organisation and management of the advisory teams gave an interesting picture of the concerns of each area.

Authority A
This authority was seen by its headteachers as well organised and clear about its objectives. They acknowledged that there had been a considerable change since the Education Reform Act and the coming of the present chief inspector who had managed the implementation of the changes needed in the advisory service.
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I’ve seen great changes over the years that I’ve been here in that now it is more regular. It is certainly more organised. It is more organised and certainly more constructive.

*Primary headteacher Authority A*

There’s been a marked change within the past 3 or 4 years, I don’t know how exactly. Either that was the National Curriculum or the Education Act inspired or a change of people or both. But certainly it’s far more positive now in terms of visits and frequency and knowing people, really knowing inspectors.

*Primary school headteacher, authority A*

‘There’s been a real change in the way the inspectorate has operated in the last few years. There is a sense that work is being managed and that they have objectives and know where they are going’

*Secondary school headteacher, authority A*

Headteachers felt supported by the inspectorate and set a high value on the general inspector role.

My attached inspector proved invaluable during my initial induction to headship - due to pastoral commitment, professionalism and counselling I have received. If the role was dramatically altered to one of purely inspectorial, then I would find it positively threatening and unsupportive.

*Primary school headteacher, authority A*

I very much value the pastoral and professional role of my attached inspector. The job of the headteacher can be lonely at times and I feel it has been of great advantage to me to discuss aspects and issues related to my school with my inspector; somebody from outside can give a different perspective to a problem.

*Primary school headteacher, authority A*

Inspectors also felt happy with the way they were managed although like advisers everywhere they had problems of time management:

A  Well I think it helps us to be better inspectors because we’re working to our own time management. We build in reflection time consideration. I definitely think it enhances the quality of what we do.

B  I’d like somebody to turn round and say, ‘No you shouldn’t be doing that’ (It) sometimes would be good for me. I mean it says something about my own time management, but I think sometimes that (although) I prefer the way we have our time on the whole, (nevertheless) it would be quite nice if someone said, ‘No, you shouldn’t be doing that.’

C  I think it’s sometimes useful to ask whether we’re actually doing the things that we should be doing. I think there’s a tendency to do the things that you like doing and some of the less pleasant things you marginalise a bit.

A  We’re only able to manage our time in the way we do because there are very clear frameworks like the fortnightly meeting, like our clear ideas about what our inspection programme is, like publishing the annual inspection programme. These things are all laid down. When we talk about being creative with our time, it’s within fairly narrow parameters because those things are fixed on a consultative basis. I think that’s another important aspect that it’s agreed within the team that this is how we’ll operate.

*Inspectors, authority A*

Advisory teachers were less happy and felt that they are not sufficiently involved:
A What I’m saying is ‘No imposition from outside’ I know I sound as if I’ve a bee in my bonnet but we’ve had too many things imposed on us without consultation. They haven’t always been working in our favour.

B They are, but having said all that things are nothing like as lax as they used to be. On the one hand total freedom and almost ignorance in the division, I think. There has been a lot which has been imposed but for the benefit of all. Whereas before I don’t think anybody knew what was going on.

Advisory teachers, authority A

It seems odd that within schools, staff are saying ‘These are my training needs. This is part of my professional development’ and it has to be followed in the school development plan. It doesn’t work for us, does it? You know there’s not even an effective communication channel for us and not being allowed to meet freely.

Advisory teacher, authority A

This wasn’t true of every advisory teacher:

I feel I’m completely free - within agreed objectives. I have a very clear direction. I have one line manager who’s a general inspector and we have 2 particular meetings in a year when we review and identify goals and that provides a framework.

Advisory teacher, authority A

Authority B

In this authority the headteachers gave evidence of uncertainty about the way in which the advisory service had changed. There was a feeling that more communication is needed.

Teachers in schools see the service as information gathering. Since the National Curriculum came in, it’s changing from information gathering to more of a schools’ inspection service ... and is moving away from being a critical friend ... which has created tensions within schools because they’re unsure what role the advisers come into school with. It’s also created tensions within the advisers themselves because they’re trying to meet the staff after, they’re trying to discuss things with the staff and the staff step back because in some ways they;re unsure of what they can say and how much they can say.

Primary school headteacher, authority B

About teachers not understanding the role of an adviser. I think this is a very important point. ... We don’t actually know how they’re making their evaluations and offering advice. ... What are they looking at? How are they going about this situation? Is it simply on the hoof or is it a deliberate plan?’

Secondary school headteacher, authority B

Quite clearly advisers talk about something and agree. They do have a plan. They don’t actually inform us until in the course of the year one or two let it slip.

Secondary school headteacher, authority B

This knowledge that there is a central file somewhere of ‘relevant and significant’ information about the school was disturbing as no one knew what was contained within it as there was no positive feedback. For trust and commitment to develop this should cease and reports and records be open on both sides. Ideally there should be discussion before a classroom visit to set the scene, explain targets and present working conditions. ... There needs to be a more open approach by the advisory service with a much clearer format and programme for the visit. This is possible but must not lose sight of their primary role which is support and encouragement not inspection.

Paper by primary school headteacher, authority B

321
Advisers were generally happy with the management and organisation of their team:

I think it's very tightly managed, the team here ... I think we're clear about expectations for us in terms of challenging support. I think the management of our time and the expectations of what we do, not to be sloppy in anything we do.

Adviser, authority B

When I talk to other specialist advisers from other parts of the country I'm quite pleased with the relative freedom that we seem to have. I mean, there are certain parts of the programme that are pre-determined but we do have freedom for a fair number of things.

Adviser, authority B

A major part of the evaluation process in this authority was the computer record:

(Of the computer record) In actual fact it sounded rather daunting and off-putting at first but its only a few minutes each day. It's keeping the sheet every day. Actually I find it quite useful at the end of each month or the end of the year to see the analysis in terms of my work over that period. It does vary at certain points of the year. ... It makes you reflect on the way your monthly programme has gone. I don't know how effective it is in improving my particular practice but it makes me feel guilty on occasion about the amount of time I haven't spent in schools.

Adviser, authority B

I think one of the concerns at the beginning - one of the things that people were worried about was the audience, the potential audience. On the one hand it's useful statistically to see what our work pattern was like over an annual period but on the other there was concern as to what use would be made of the detail.

Adviser, authority B

It did make me, just starting, make me look again at how things were organised and fit visits and places closer together and to be a bit more effective so it did help with that.

Adviser, authority B

Authority C

The move to a general adviser role was comparatively recent in this authority and a limited amount was laid down about it:

Each general adviser is expected to spend 3 - 6 days, according to the size of the school, in developing work in his or her general schools. This is expected to be clearly focussed. They spend about 70% or their time on inspection and 30% on support. Records are completed for each visit which go onto a database. The pressure to develop inspection has been balanced by the reduction of in-service education because the pattern is no longer one which schools find meets their needs.

Chief adviser, authority C

The problems of the move to the general adviser role in this authority are evident in the comments made by headteachers. Some find this a helpful role; others see little point in it:
As a new head the link with the general adviser has been a lifeline to the LEA both in terms of contact and in terms of the range of services and I’ve been particularly fortunate in that I’ve developed a working relationship with the general adviser. He has been involved in running training and development, development planning, in-service work with staff, inter college and our recent experience that the link is new with the general adviser as well as our community adviser (has been) a tremendous learning experience for the whole college. The general adviser’s role, I’ve found as a new head has been crucial in establishing the link and getting the range of contact that you can’t easily get yourself.

Community college principal, authority C

As a new head who’s not been in the authority for 13 years, I’ve found the general adviser role awkward and I’ve gone to people rather than through the general adviser.
Secondary school headteacher, authority C

I regret to say that... my first general adviser in this authority said, ‘I don’t really know why I’ve got this job’ and kept not turning up for meetings that were arranged and the next one said he was retiring in a few months and the third one’s applying for other jobs.
Secondary school headteacher, authority C

On the whole it seems to me that the generalist route has been a disastrous decision and one I deplore.... I wouldn’t be that dismissive but my own personal experience is that the process where specialist into generalist and particularly huge attempts to go cross phase, huge attempts to become knowledgeable on all fronts was close to being disastrous, in my view.
Secondary school headteacher, authority C

One of my conversations was with the music adviser. She said, ‘I’m a musician. I don’t even know what to do as a general adviser’ and that was an honest admission from one subject specialist into a role she was thrust into that she wasn’t originally appointed to.
Secondary school headteacher, authority C

My general adviser, I’m very fond of but I think he would be the first to agree that his heart’s not in being a general adviser. His heart is in his special subject which he’s very good at and I do wonder really, I suppose I have to say that the structure is fine on paper but it’s so shattering for some people, isn’t it, the change of structure. It depends very much... on the general adviser you get... so you can range from one like mine who is very amiable and I have to say, exceptionally helpful, but he wouldn’t really see his role as coming to talk to me about the development plan.
Secondary school headteacher, authority C

They haven’t been recruited for this. Of course if they’d been recruited for general work it would be rather different because you’d be trying to get people who’d got the right experience for it.
Secondary school headteacher, authority C

The authority also had both general advisers and specialist advisers. This was an inheritance from a previous organisation and the idea was to phase out the specialists in favour of generalists with specialisms:

I’m going to identify myself straight away that I think there’s also the issue of the division between curriculum advisers and general advisers and that has tended, certainly in my work, to sometimes marginalise the curriculum advisers and impacts on the work of the general adviser. And the other issue of the curriculum adviser’s work across county, they’re not restricted to a particular team. So that is a tension - a different dimension of working. And I think what has certainly happened is that sometimes the curriculum advisers have felt marginalised because they’ve not been involved in actually what has been discussed and all the general plans.
Adviser, authority C
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We’re (curriculum advisers) gradually dropping out of the team ... We disappear and are not replaced. Different areas of the curriculum disappear so you’re not actually providing across the board curriculum support anyway. So I guess most authorities have gone down the line of the general adviser with a specialism attached to them and I can’t see any other way round that. But I think it does create lots of problems in terms of the adequacy of support that can be given. They’re two separate responsibilities and when you’re talking about selling the services you’ve got a real tension there. 

Adviser, authority C

A I think what concerns me ... is that the curriculum has been frozen out. In fact because of the inspectorial role that’s been taking over and people have had to cover the schools, the curriculum aspect has actually been diminished and so people are general advisers. They are not curriculum advisers. This is where primary teachers want the input.

B That is something I was going to say, that at a time when we’ve become very subject orientated, we’ve lost the expertise of the advisory service, because they ... have had to become general advisers. 

Primary school headteachers, authority C

It does seem to me that over appointing staff and things of that sort, it’s tremendously helped...if you’re appointing a modern linguist ... I mean it’s tremendously important to have somebody there who can speak the language and so on and give you proper curriculum advice on how to set it up. 

Secondary school headteacher authority C

The authority also had an area team structure which was set up at the same time as the general adviser role. It went through a period of difficulty and was beginning to find a way forward:

I think the other thing I’d like to say about the particular area team that I’m in. There was a lot of - we didn’t have rows, but there was a lot of ‘I don’t want to be part of it’ in the team and some people just not coming at all. We didn’t have, I don’t think, the same cohesion at the beginning and that’s gradually changed but there was quite a lot of negative feeling, some people sitting there there thinking, or even saying ‘I don’t want to be here. I’d rather be doing something else.’

Adviser, authority C

As a newcomer I found the structures very helpful and initially being a member of a smaller team within one of the areas was particularly useful in terms of the initial induction process and having a network of people that I could quickly associate with and actually allow myself to get functional. I also found that the sort of procedures within the area team were quite clearly laid out for a newcomer. It was very apparent who your line manager was and what were the procedures you went through in the majority of cases to get things done.

Adviser, authority C

I think all the difficulty I’ve found in terms of managing an area team is not being clear about which are the area team’s responsibilities and which issues are actually made at area and county or even in departments. And it’s sometimes a difficulty of not being sure what we can do and what we can’t do. 

Senior adviser, authority C

The one question I’ve got in relation to the team structure ... was just how consistent are we within the teams that are operating at the moment and therefore the networking structure between the teams needs to be perhaps formalised and looked at and examined in terms of providing a more consistent approach and a more consistent service. I don’t think many LEAs have actually cracked that one.

Adviser, authority C
One headteacher felt that things were beginning to go well:

I like the way they're becoming more consumer orientated. ... (The county) has this tradition of advisers there if you need them but don't bother too much if you don't and so there's always been this tradition of consumer friendliness to it - and it doesn't just go for advisory, it's the whole county operates in this way, are much more responsive to our needs as a school than they were in the past. ... It's good we can say 'We want this service please can you provide it?' So I like the way things are going on that score.

I do feel for them, because I've known some of these people for a long time and I know they're anxious about their futures.

Primary school headteacher, authority C

Authority D

The principal concern in authority D was the split between inspection and advice. The concern ran through all levels in the service:

I think initially people were concerned about the separation between inspector and adviser. Many colleagues had come into this service because they saw a duality in inspection and advice. They felt that one couldn't separate one from the other. There were professional demands in carrying out an inspection process which is not only objective but developmental. That developmental side is very much linked to an advisory side as well. I think people felt uneasy about that.

Principal adviser, authority D

I think there's no doubt that if you take the inspection team, ... they've been able to concentrate far more on that function and the roles of inspection and give more time to their working procedures and documentation that they use. They've been able to give the whole process more quality time than if they were trying to run a centre and be called on for advice left, right and centre as we and we certainly felt ... that everybody is complaining about overload, that this would be a very good way of actually being very clear about what the role is and being able to manage time.

Assistant chief education officer and head of inspection advice and support service branch, authority D

A I'm quite happy to have inspection and advice separated, because I did not understand the advisory service. I would not be happy if the roles were merged because I wouldn't be happy trying to merge well with the class of inspector. I think the inspectors are far less happy because they don't actually like their role so much, that's the impression I've gained.

B I would be quite happy to see a merging of roles. I... was an advisory teacher at the time when it happened and it didn't make sense to me and it still doesn't make sense in practice to separate the 2 roles.

C Yes, I agree with that... I can't see how you separate inspection from advice. I think they go hand in hand and you know, to make an artificial division between them when you're inspecting a school and when you're offering advice to a school is not very helpful.

Advisers, authority D

But there is a big difference in the way schools perceive us. If we go in as advisers they see us as being there to help and support. When inspectors go in they're inclined to see them in a different light and I think the whole image that school has of the person is very important in terms of how you can help.

Adviser, authority D
I have only been an inspector for 9 months and previously I had 5 years of being a seconded primary headteacher ... and that was very much advisory work and I thought it was going to be a most enormous change in my life becoming an inspector. I would have been much happier to have become a primary adviser but that wasn’t to be the case. I think I agree ... that being an inspector does incorporate being an adviser at times specifically through the inspection mode. ... You cannot not be an adviser any more than when you’re inspecting a school when you’re talking with teachers, issues that have come up through their teaching and through the management of the school. You can’t not do this (except by) moving to an advisory mode and so I don’t think I’ve found it such an enormous change.

Inspector, authority D

I think there’s still a great deal of confusion in schools about the difference in roles and people find it difficult to distinguish between an adviser and inspector even when an inspector has arrived for the job a good time after the division took place.

Inspector, authority D

Schools did not welcome the split between advice and inspection:

I disagree with the separation (of inspection and advice) I think in the long term anyway the new arrangements for the inspection ... to have a group of people registered, who actually spend all the time inspecting and if they’ve got to inspect a quarter of the schools in (the county) every year to get the 4 year cycle out, then I’m unhappy in the long term about their perceptions that they actually have in terms of the county as a whole (and) strategic movements nationally. I think schools have benefited more from advice than inspection. I mean the sort of big bang inspection that we’ve had in (this county) as in other midland authorities hasn’t actually produced the results that advice to a particular curriculum area would have actually produced.

Secondary school headteacher, authority D

'I can never quite make out who I turn to on certain occasions. My staff aren’t absolutely clear either and they have much more to do with the teams than I do by the very nature of the fact that they would be talking with the advisory teams and sometimes with the inspectors.

Secondary school headteacher, authority D

I value advice 500 times more than I value inspection. ... I prefer to look at one particular curriculum area. ... but I need to learn from the (advisory service) trends nationally, the backdrop, to put my school against that or into the context and I need advice and help in terms of the way ahead.

Secondary school headteacher, authority D

I can see the rationale for doing it (splitting advice and inspection) that the interests of the 2 groups are different but I hope the relations between them are good because if the advice is to be worthwhile it’s got to come from what the inspectors are finding out and unless they get that communication right then they may well be doing what people don’t want, so it would bother me if the 2 departments were totally separate from each other. I think that communication’s crucial.

Secondary school headteacher, authority D

This is (a concern) that has arisen with an HMI but the same thing could occur with the county inspectorate and that is that although the advisory services have split to some extent an inspector still needs to be able to ‘give advice. A concern has arisen where an inspector came in and had a criticism to make but when asked, “Well how should we do it?” ‘I’m not here for that purpose. I’m not an adviser.’ I think that it a very wrong way to go.

Middle school teacher, authority D
This authority used its inspectors in the general adviser role:

The district inspector has responsibility for visiting a number of schools cross phase and on a regular basis and the idea really is to negotiate... a particular line of evaluation with the school. It involves at its best observation within the classrooms and district inspectors have schedules to work from and a focus each term. ... School development plan is something we return to again and again and we try to demonstrate... just how important the school development plan is.

*Principal inspector, authority D*

The district inspector has responsibility for monitoring the plan (following inspection) and we attach after an inspection, a link adviser and the adviser’s responsibility is to coordinate support for that school

*Assistant chief education officer and head of inspection, advice and support service branch, authority D*

The authority had, at the time of the field work, just set out its future plans for schools and was offering them packages of services. Advisers were feeling pleased because the large majority of the school were taking them up. There were some concerns from schools and inspectors were still waiting for their turn to come.

One of the worries I’ve got is that when they package so many diverse things together. They might not seem diverse up there but when it actually comes into school, yes, you’re in a cleft stick, because you either accept the whole package and get a platinum deal or you opt in and only get a gold. If you opt in and get a gold package rather than a platinum one, it costs you a great deal. It’s foolish not to go for platinum, but they’re telling us we’ve got a choice. We haven’t got a choice.

*Primary school headteacher, authority D*

All the energies have gone to making sure that packages do very much concern the advisory branch, that everybody knows about that and that everything is up and running for that and there has almost been at times, the comment that, you know, we’ve got time to think about you because you’re not coming on stream when everybody else is and then, of course, what is going to happen to inspection in general terms, regarding what comes out from the DfE (Department for Education), so I think, you know it hasn’t been a situation where we’ve been not loved and forgotten. It’s a case of ‘our turn will come.’

*Inspector, authority D*

### Planning

All 4 authorities had well organised arrangements for planning. This was easiest in authority A where the whole team could easily be involved in all the planning. It was not too difficult in authority B which could have some involvement of the whole group but it became a much more difficult matter in the 2 larger authorities.

We do have task groups and all the task groups have memberships across the teams from the networks. Each network will put 2 or 3 people forward, seeking to create, not just the rhetoric of working together but some practical examples.

*Principal adviser, authority D*

I think the arrangements for inspection, for example, and the more formal planning is an example of (our planning) where (the chief adviser) certainly leads it and maybe a group of people will simply plan the development and the draft is put to colleagues for consideration.

*Adviser, authority B*
I think we've been reasonably involved at the planning level. I mean, the team leaders of the area teams (advisory teacher leaders) have a regular meeting with the line managers and project managers. It's quite difficult to know how much you've been involved because really there are decisions going on at another level but I guess as team leaders we would feel we've a reasonable forum but how much that has affected what actually happened I would hesitate to say.

Advisory teacher, authority C

One of the things I miss in the advisory service is the notion of collaborative working amongst colleagues. I think, you know, in a good school and effective school you often get more of this ... and I understand why we don’t get it to the same extent here. We've got very busy diaries and we've got many, many different aspects to the job that need to be done in limited time, but I ... dislike the notion of making decisions, which you sometimes have to do without really having made an effort to work with other people on it.

Adviser, authority D

Communication

Most organisations have communication problems and these have been made more difficult by the Department for Education which now sends material directly to schools with only a few copies to the LEA. In the small authority these may get to the advisers. In the large authority this is often a problem. All 4 authorities made considerable efforts to communicate within the team.

And we do have designated times within the year when we all come together. For example, we're doing that this week when the focus is going to be on inspection or on in-service or appraisal or whatever, so that those days are blocked into our diaries and they are essentially planning days.

Adviser, authority B

In theory we have 4 weekly access to the area team of advisers ... For some, one of the teams, it’s worked very well and it’s been a regular one. For 2 of the others it hasn’t actually worked as it ought. For instance they met with our team of advisers and curriculum advisers only twice during the year, where other areas have met more, I think.

Advisory teacher, authority C

I find I'm not involved at all. I fact I find it difficult to find out information that I think is relevant to my work and knowing where to go, finding that information out, or knowing that that information might exist that would actually support me.

Advisory teacher, authority C

A I keep going into schools and to governing body meetings and find I don’t actually know what it is the head is actually talking to me about because the schools have had all the information and we haven’t.

B Mind you, I think massive efforts are made to keep us informed. We all complain about the huge quantities of paper we lift from our pigeon holes, now an enormous amount of those papers are to do with the effort to keep us informed and I don’t always read things as carefully as I ought or I put it on one side to be read later and that’s maybe one reason why I miss information. ... I just feel that the climate of education is such at the moment that it’s probably impossible to know everything about all that is happening. I do feel people try very hard to keep us informed.

Advisers, authority D
I think there’s an immense effort made to communicate. I mean there’s an absolute deluge, an avalanche of paper work. It’s worse in the advisory service or in the education authority than it is schools in my experience, although it may have got worse in schools in the past 18 months. Nobody tries to ... keep things away from you. There isn’t time to look at the things which come. There’s a lot of communication in that respect and about the big decisions when they’re made. Normally, with the odd exception, there’s a lot of explanation about why the decisions are being made so no criticism about that. It’s probably to do with the uncertainties of the moment the difficulty of trying to find time to work things through.

Inspector, authority D

In authority D there was also the problem of communication between the 2 branches of the service.

And there are problems with communication ... We inspected one particular school, for example, where the headteacher went to the advisers and said 'Well inspectors are saying we shouldn’t be doing projects any more' and the advisers came back to us and said 'What are you doing? You’re undermining the way we feel about things.'

Principal inspector, authority D

The use of time

Advisers and advisory teachers suggested that time is a problem in advisory work. This is a problem which will need attention as authorities try to sell services since schools will expect to get an agreed amount of time:

I almost feel that we’ve got the worst of both worlds. ... Nobody dictates what they do to our diaries but we do get castigated too about whether or not things are in our diaries and in some ways it would be easier - I would hate it - but in some ways it would be easier if somebody said 'This what you’re going to do and this is when you’re going to do it'. That would at least tell them what commitments I’d got that I couldn’t move and I could plan accordingly for the rest of the time but there appears to be no link between what we have to do and the amount of time in which we have to do it.

Adviser, authority C

I suspect the commitment to the amount of time we spend in schools and working in schools that will have to be set down more, particularly where you’re talking about selling services to schools. You have to have some form of guarantee that you are actually (going) to spend the time there.

Adviser, authority C

I was very impressed with the level of professionalism where people prepared a thing, the hours they worked; teachers work long hours too, it just seemed that many people in the advisory service were working longer hours than I had ever anticipated. I think it’s something we’re very much aware of but it’s not something anyone tells you.

Adviser, authority B

I get the impression that we don’t get any feedback as to whether the department are happy. ... But my impression of those who are line managers actually have no time to manage. So I do not know how my line manager would know how well I was doing because he has no time in which to manage me. He only has time to talk to me and I find that valuable, but in the sense of knowing what I’m doing and seeking the views of other people he does not have time to do that.

Adviser, authority C
A Tremendous freedom. I think that's one of the big differences between our role and that of the inspectors. They're given a programme to work to whereas we have tremendous freedom with our time at the moment. I think it'll change considerably in September.

B I have found this year ... that although you try to plan your diary carefully, you know when your in-service commitments and appointments with schools are, when you're drawn into working groups on a range of issues they tend to be short order things because of the pattern of change at the moment, you know, considerable time pressure upon them and suddenly all your careful planning of your diary goes to pot.

Advisers, authority D

Evaluation

Advisers and advisory teachers in all 4 authorities were giving a good deal of thought to evaluating the work they were doing.

We set up success criteria for the LINC (Language in the National Curriculum) project fairly early on ... and now we've looked to see if we've fulfilled those long term things like changing attitudes ... but I think it's rather more difficult in doing things for schools because they're so vague about what their aims are and they're not sure what they hope to get out of it. For some schools it's a very new exercise.

Advisory teacher, authority A

We had quite an extensive evaluation of the SATs (Standard Assessment Tasks) training, meeting with groups of invited teachers, with representatives from those groups going to other groups, so that we had a very structured feedback from that particular exercise.

Adviser, authority B

In our secondary schools we have a two yearly cycle and we review the work of all departments and that's an in-depth review, effectiveness, the running and so on of the specialist departments.

Adviser, authority B

We have a cycle which involves analysing your annual programme so that we discuss very gainfully what we have got out as a service over the year, so that individually we reflect on our year's work. We make a draft and these are all put together as an advisory report of the advisory team. And so, in a sense, we look backwards as well as forwards. And it also requires individuals to develop short and long term plans. So individually we are asked to look at our own analysis and our own role in addition to a role on team lines.

Adviser, authority B

I've done a bit of work on evaluating review, team review, but that was only one aspect. It was really trying to identify what people valued, advisers, heads and inspectors and what could be improved. It was like an interim evaluation to get things feeding back into the system, but we haven't done anything in depth. Although I suppose, I mean, I don't like to mention it, but in fact the appraisal could have potential - we do actually want feedback on particular effective work. We could use that profile, to seek feedback on the area you want to look at.

Senior adviser, authority C

This is an area which is going to be absolutely crucial in the future, you know. It's something we're traditionally not very good at is the process of evaluation. I mean I sense it's something that we all do pretty much as individuals, anyway. we're constantly doing it, but it's not particularly systematic in the way that it's approached and very often the information that you get back from schools can be fashioned by the questionnaire that you use or the questions that you ask. Very often it's out of date. By the time you actually act upon it the schools have moved on and their starting points are very different and therefore it's not very helpful.

Adviser, authority C
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I'm not certain that a tick sheet at the end of a course is that helpful, but I do feel that... at the end of a period of in-service training... allowing colleagues to go into school and try things, often I've found that colleagues have come back, 'Well now I know a little bit more I can try this out. I've tried this out with a group of youngsters' and I think it sets up a general debate. Well that is to me to some extent giving you some indication of how successful or how you haven't been that successful in giving colleagues some help and support in that area of curriculum.

Advisory teacher, authority C

Q  How do you evaluate your work?
A  Something as one fairly new in post, I'm trying to come to terms with at the moment. The in-service is nearly cracked in a sense in that there is an evaluation that the advisory teacher I work with and I do for ourselves immediately after each input. There has been an evaluation that we get from course members at the end of the course and we're working now on something for them to send back to us, let's say six months later to say what you've implemented in school. That aspect of it we're nearly comfortable with. What we are wrestling with at the moment is evaluating what we are doing when we go into a school and meet with the staff or a headteacher. we haven't got an answer to that yet, although if we see some kind of change taking place then perhaps it's been effective.

Adviser, authority D

In the long term training that we've been doing for the 4+ initiative, we have linked our visits to the units. One of the things we actually specifically look for is evidence of the effectiveness of in-service in the practice, in what we see on the walls, in the teachers' planning and that sort of thing. We're consciously looking for that and if it's not there then the question is why not. Was the delivery not good? Was the subject not right?

Adviser, authority D

In terms of in-service we've had an immediate team review of effectiveness, viewing what went on in terms of presentation and content. In terms of school visits and project work we're looking at... the school identifying an issue and we're working on strategies we work together on and then what our input may be and we then look in terms of what data we're going to gather to indicate whether the work we've done has been effective and that might be in terms of collecting children's work, in terms of observation in the classroom of teachers, making observations or whatever, from various sources.

Advisory teacher, authority D

Clerical assistance

There has been a tradition of under-providing clerical assistance for the advisory service (cf Small 1982, Audit Commission 1989). There appears to be still some unsatisfactory provision for some advisers and advisory teachers.

A lot of the areas I feel frustrated by, I suppose, and that's the word I'd put, are things like goals being set without the practicalities for the achievement being laid out. I mean one good example for me, would be the lack of defined clerical support and support of hardware and software.

Advisory teacher, authority C

I've worked in the system where you sort of tap into a pool of help as opposed to having somebody attached to your team which is the current situation for maths and there is no question about which is the better way of providing support. To have somebody who is always attached to your team who starts to understand the way it works and can handle enquiries sometimes herself, feels part of you, feels part of all the meetings you have, you, shares your triumphs with you. There's no question, it's much better than a pool.

Adviser, authority D
My support is appalling. I type all my own in-service, well, A and I between us do the typing up ourselves, we do the photocopying ourselves, we do all our own filing. If we are writing individual letters, we do that ourselves. If I'm writing a letter that needs to go out to say 20 different headteachers, I've got to ask for clerical support because I've not got the IT skills to do that. We have severe problems over telephone messages.

Adviser, authority D

I think our assistance is very poor, certainly in our team. We do all our own. You've got to write any reports or anything. You just do it yourself. You automatically do it yourself. There's no one there to provide any backup. So that's certainly a problem and always has been.

Advisory teacher, authority D

The role of advisory teachers

The advisory teachers had rather different roles in the different authorities. In all, however, they were responsible to advisers or inspectors and in 3 they were the overall responsibility of a senior member of the advisory team who was responsible for their training in some cases.

I work with (general adviser) and we had a meeting last week, a two hour meeting and we established what we were going to be looking at and focussing our attention on next year. So I think the overall brief is through... my line manager. The day-to-day and to some extent a lot of the future planning is very much for me to establish myself.

Advisory teacher, authority C

I like to be quite involved with what my advisory teachers do and I have 2, both mathematics... One's primary and one's secondary and they change quite frequently over a period of 5 or 6 years, so I seem to spend most of my time inducting new advisory teachers in and it's quite a large responsibility.

Inspector, authority A

Some of my teachers liked quite a lot of contact because they wanted to share what they'd done and others preferred to be a bit more separate so they could develop their own autonomy. But I think the whole aspect of their personal development and their own career development for advisory teachers is quite a crucial one.

Inspector, authority A

There was concern among advisory teachers about changes.

I was appointed 3 years ago as part of a primary maths team, which had a third of the county and I had half a day working in different schools and I went into classrooms and I worked with teachers in classrooms and I took staff meetings and I ran teacher days. I had that contact with teachers. Now at the end of that year the whole structure changed and we became part of an area team and much more general... 'No you don't go and work with teachers in the classrooms any more. That is not on the agenda' and although the one was much more expensive on advisory teacher time, I would say it was far more effective.

Advisory teacher, authority C
In authority C some advisory teachers were appointed by a group of headteachers to work in their schools:

I have a feeling that I'm responsible to the group of schools to which I have a first contact. I have a line manager who's a general adviser, but a large amount of the work we do as a curriculum support team is under the control... of the group of schools, the decisions of the group of schools....

Certainly a lot of the day-to-day work is to do with what they want rather than the authority deciding what they were going to do.

Advisory teacher, authority C

Some advisory teachers felt there was a need for advisory teachers to meet and discuss their work together.

I think occasionally there should be some formal occasions, again we've always got this problem of time, making the time, that perhaps something wrong with the system and we perhaps ought to make time, even if it's a once a year conference for advisory teachers to come together, or a once termly meeting programmed in.

Advisory teacher, authority D

Summary

Findings in relation to the questions asked
1 Advisers in authority A thought highly of their organisation and management. Those in authority B thought it satisfactory in the main. Authority C advisers were more critical with 4 poor scores and the advisers in authority D thought more highly of their organisation and management than did the inspectors.

Where advisory teachers were concerned, authority B scored highly but this may be due to the small number of responses. Authority A had a fair response and authority C had satisfactory responses but no good ones. Authority D also scored well but again this may be because of the low return.

2 There was no significant correlation between organisation and management and advice and support or between organisation and management and teacher development. It was not possible to correlate inspection with organisation and management because of the small size of the sample.

Other findings
1 Authority A had high scores for advisers for the items 'We have a clear management organisation' and 'Our management organisation works well' in contrast to authorities C and D. Similarly authority B had high scores for advisory teachers for these items. These two authorities have had high scores for advisers and advisory teachers respectively for a number of the criteria and it may be that good management of inspectors in the case of authority A and advisory teachers in the case of authority B had
something to do with this. It may also be relevant in this context that authorities C and D had all the critical comments in the questionnaires.

2 Authority B’s computer record which was more elaborate than any of the others was appreciated by advisers but headteachers were suspicious of what information was being kept.

3 Authority C was still having some difficulty in establishing the general adviser role. There was also a problem in having specialists as well as generalists. Schools wanted specialist advice, however. The area organisation was beginning to work well, but there appeared to be some uncertainty about boundaries between the centre and the areas.

4 Authority D’s split between advice and inspection was not popular with anyone. Schools, in particular, saw little point in it and advisers and inspectors were not enthusiastic about it although the principal inspector felt that it had given inspectors time to look into what was involved in inspection more carefully than would otherwise have been the case.

5 All 4 authorities had well-organised arrangements for planning.

6 There appeared to be a problem of communication in authorities C and D, in spite of a good deal of work on this by the managers of those teams. There also appeared to be a communication problem in authority B between advisers and headteachers. The problems, not surprisingly, appeared to increase with the size of the team and the split between advisers and inspectors in authority D did not help their communication.

7 The use of time was a problem for advisers because their planned programme was always being interrupted by emergencies and crises and additional tasks. This will require careful handling when services are on sale. It may be that some people should be left free to handle emergencies.

8 The 4 authorities used a variety of methods of evaluation. These included questionnaires following in-service courses and enquiries after an interval, user groups, a yearly review using computer records and culminating in a report on the work of the service, visits by the chief inspector to discuss inspectors’ work with schools, observation in schools to see what has been implemented from in-service training, appraisal and setting criteria and assessing progress against them..
Some advisers and advisory teachers in particular still lack adequate clerical support and this makes them less effective.

The role of advisory teachers varies considerably even among these 4 authorities. In all 4 they are responsible to an individual adviser but in authority C some are also responsible to a group of headteachers.
16 THE TRAINING OF ADVISERS, INSPECTORS AND ADVISORY TEACHERS

Introduction

Advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers come into advisory work at a comparatively late stage in their careers. They have normally held senior posts in schools or colleges and have acquired some of the skills and knowledge they need in their new role. There is a great deal still to learn however. The world of the LEA office is different from that of schools and fostering the development of professional adults is different from teaching children or even from working as a headteacher or senior member of staff in a school. Inspection of a school as an outsider is also different from evaluating the work of a school as a headteacher.

This has not been appreciated until comparatively recently but was clearly set out in the two reports of advisory work by the Audit Commission (1989) and Stillman and Grant (1989). As a result of these reports, and as a result of the emphasis on inspection brought about by the Education Reform Act (1988) it was evident from a survey by Dean (1991b) that those LEAs which had not provided training in the past had started to provide it.

Any account of training should take into account that people learn as much informally as they do formally and informal learning is particularly valuable if it is seen and used as a means of learning.

Relevant literature

Bolam et al (1978, p.239) concluded from their study of advisers as innovators that, 'There is a clear need to develop, pilot and evaluate training materials and programmes for advisers in the light of this report’s findings and other experience’.

They noted that at that time that few advisers seemed to have any clear idea of what advisory work involved when they applied for their first advisory post. They went on to say that less than 15% received any training in the role and this was more likely in large teams. They suggested that there should be training in clinical supervision skills, evaluation of teachers, change skills, evaluation of institutions, team training and role workshops, administrative and curriculum theory.

Stillman and Grant (1989 p.174) also noted the lack of training for advisers and made the point that advisory work required specialist skills over and above those needed by teachers and headteachers.

We are suggesting that advisory work is a separate and different professional role from teaching and headship and that to consider it as anything more than a very vague extension of these areas is to do it no justice whatsoever.
They suggested that teachers and headteachers moving into advisory work needed induction, knowledge of other phases of education, knowledge of education law, counselling and interpersonal skills, skill in classroom observation and evaluation, skill in running in-service courses, interviewing skills, ability to write appropriate reports and much else.

Stillman and Grant (1989, p. 166,163) listed chief advisers’ views on advisers’ in-service needs and identified those elements which advisers regard as being most significant. The percentages were those given by advisers. The following is a list of those items which attracted a score of more than 10%:

- Acquisition of knowledge of other phases and specialisms (beyond one’s own); finance; education law; information technology (11%).
- Management skills; leadership skills; the management of change and the management of time (22%).
- General updating on curricular and other issues, central initiatives, DES reports, research etc (10.4%).
- Counselling, interpersonal, group and communication skills; stress management (14.8%).
- Cross-curricular work; multicultural education; PSE (personal and social education); mainstream SEN (special educational needs); industry links; equal opportunities etc. (14.7%).
- Courses CAID (Centre for Adviser and Inspector Development); NAIEA (National Association of Inspectors and Educational Advisers); DES; higher degrees etc. (24.7%).
- Institutional management; staffing; special procedures (14.7%).
- Discussions with colleagues, meetings, combined visiting and working, teamwork (18.8%).
- Curriculum management and development (11.0%).

They quoted some advisers’ views on training. The following comment by an adviser sums up some of the views of the researchers:

Too many people - officers and elected members - appear to believe that advisers have no further need for training once in post. If the team structure is vague and imprecise, there is no way that either the general or the specific needs of the individual and team can be precisely identified and met. There are so many initiatives from all sides that it is essential to have to study them and to weigh up their implications and methods of implementation. There should be an element of further training built into advisers’ job descriptions and provision allowed in their workloads - the funding and provision of such training should be regarded as a priority for the central authorities.

The Audit Commission (1989, p.33) stressed the need for training for advisers and suggested that the following areas should be covered:

- oral feedback of observation of teaching; - the writing of the various categories of report which will be needed for teachers, lecturers, headteachers, principals, governors and LEA members;
- cooperation with staff and governors of institutions;
- general acquaintance with a range of evaluative methods;
- time management;
- record-keeping.

They suggested that in addition there was ‘a continuing requirement specifically for the induction of new inspectors and advisers and generally for the professional development of all staff.’

They also advised that induction was needed to learn about the working of the LEA, the
roles of officers, local and national issues of current concern and opportunities to learn about phases and aspects of education not part of the previous experience of advisers. They suggested shadowing an experienced adviser. Further training should be through sharing of experience and appraisal. The time requirements of training should be recognised.

Pearce (1986) suggested that advisers and inspectors needed training in counselling skills, team-building, the dynamic of curriculum change, the ability to analyse organisational cultures, curriculum analysis and timetable construction and awareness of their own impact on others.

Dean (1992) noted the need for a professional development policy for advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers and gave a list of areas in which training might be needed. This included knowledge of essential legislation, local government and the education service, what is involved in advisory work, child development, curriculum, learning theory, organisation and management, equal opportunities, pastoral care and discipline, school self-evaluation, the skills involved in assessment and evaluation, inspection, reporting and report writing, making surveys, dealing with failing teachers, in-service work, advising on school building, interpersonal skills and selection interviewing.

Nixon and Rudduck (1992) looked at the way in which local authority advisory teams were working in inspecting schools and concluded that there was need for training to extend analytic and research skills and a deepening of advisers' understanding of the role of research in inspection.

Matthews (1990, p.7) studied the work of advisory teachers and concluded that more training for them was needed. He made a number of recommendations for training of advisory teachers. Among a long list of possible areas, important points seemed to be:

Training in counselling skills, making contracts with schools, the role and function of the change agent, designing and delivering INSET, interpersonal skills, action research training and knowledge of organisational development.

Dean (1981) noted the importance of providing opportunities for advisers to renew their vision as well as maintaining necessary skills and knowledge.

HMI (1988, p.12) in their survey of the effect of the implementation of the local authority training grant scheme were critical of the lack of training for advisers. They noted that a significant number of new advisers had been appointed but few had been trained. There were also appointments of in-service coordinators in many authorities who also lacked training. They also noted the lack of training and support for advisory teachers:

The lack of training offered to advisory teachers, the problems of their career structure and a failure by too many LEAs to define their role and relationship with other groups in the support services requires urgent attention.
Zimpher and Rieger (1988, p.178) described some of the knowledge domains needed for mentoring new teachers and others in need. Their description of mentoring in the USA suggests an activity very similar to that carried out by advisory teachers and some advisers and the knowledge domains are therefore relevant in terms of training needed:

1. assessing the needs of beginning teachers in the local district;
2. developing the inter-personal capacities of mentoring through knowledge of theories of adult development;
3. understanding of classroom processes and school effectiveness;
4. utilising instructional supervision, observation and feedback capacities;
5. fostering a dispository towards inquiry and reflectivity.

Small (1990) and Heller (1989 p.39) described the work done by the Centre for Adviser and Inspector training (CAID) at Woolley hall, Wakefield and the course being offered to inspectors and advisers to prepare them for a role in inspection in particular. Heller noted that it consisted of twelve units divided into four modules with three units per module. ‘Module A deals with new tasks and roles, offering an overview and and focusing on observation and assessment skills. B is inspection in all its forms - the techniques and strategies of inspection and a focus on evaluating and reporting the outcome. Appraisal and evaluation forms module C and the final module D covers LEA systems for inspection and development.’ LEAs were invited to send an adviser to the course with the idea that he or she would then conduct similar training with colleagues.

Andrews (1987) described the way in which induction of new advisers was carried out in one authority. The induction started with two days in the area office getting to know the staff and the way the work was organised. This was followed by a programme of visiting schools with other advisers or advisory teachers which lasted for the first half term. The whole advisory team contributed to an expose of the new adviser’s schools. Documents were introduced stage by stage as they became relevant. In the second half term part of the time was spent on responding to calls and curriculum needs and part on specific tasks, skills or systems. There were opportunities to examine the process of staff appointments and to observe interviews and three days were spent in each of a primary, middle and high school observing a normal day and discussing the role of the headteacher. An appraisal was undertaken in the last week of the term. Support in the third term was planned as a result of the appraisal with regular discussions of specific educational issues. Reports were required at various stages and there were weekly or fortnightly meetings with the senior adviser.

Higginbottom and Conway (1990 p.17) described the development of the Barnsley team of advisers and made the following point about the development needs of individuals:

These will only be met if we can make professional development part of the day-to-day activity of a team committed to participation.
They also quote the reactions of a newly joined colleague who said:

I have not been 'trained' but I am involved in a process of continuous development, meeting new challenges in a questioning and supportive environment.

O’Mahony and Sollars (1990, pp 33, 34, 36) described a training programme for advisory teachers in Hampshire. This centred on 5 themes - ‘team building, role related learning (as change agents, as INSET providers) team working procedures, self development and disengagement/re-entry’. The programme included workshops of role negotiation, role analysis, goal setting and action planning, together with self disclosure and trust exercises. Direct training sessions concentrated on strategies and skills to be employed with adult learners and the organisation and delivery of INSET.

They concluded that particular aspects of the programme were very successful. The team building exercises ‘accelerated the processes of openness and trust development within the group, resulting in an early development of team working.’ ‘The encouragement of peer counselling pairs was a valuable strategy for some team members providing them with support and feedback, important to their personal development.’ There was also satisfaction with the growth of the team as a self-development group.

Parry (1990, p.15) described the training organised by the Welsh Joint education Committee. Parry was seconded to run this training which had 5 aims:

- to identify the training and development needs of officers and advisers;
- to provide a programme to meet these needs;
- to build up a directory of training expertise in the authorities;
- to set up an information exchange or a document bank;
- to assist LEAs to pool efforts in responding to change.

The change to which they were responding was the change to monitoring and inspecting brought about by the Education Reform Act of 1988. Since then further changes have come about.

Stillman and Grant (1989 pp.170, 171) also reviewed the situation on adviser appraisal which 108 advisers described at that time as fully operational. Those who had yet to be appraised ‘gave greater emphasis to clarifying roles, aiding professional development, improving effectiveness through the provision of feedback on performance, enhancing efficiency, identifying strengths and rectifying weaknesses.’ Those who had experienced appraisal ‘tended to emphasise the process benefits; they gave more weight to the opportunity appraisal presented for reflection, for the time allowed with the chief adviser and for the opportunity to express views.’

Evans (1989, p.8) stressed the importance of advisers and inspectors undergoing
appraisal. He suggested that it would offer the following:

a) It will put behind us any ideas of advisers who move around doing their own thing and providing their own motivation.

b) It will correct imbalances and consolidate training.

c) It will allow the updating of job descriptions.

d) It will encourage advisers to feel part of an authority’s coherent policy for inspection and support.

e) It recognises ‘realpolitik’. We shall have relatively few additional advisers and the miracle will be wrought by the good and indifferent colleagues we know already. Advisers are a very expensive resource.

f) It will allow the chief adviser to manage the advisory division and will encourage all LEAs to recognise the need for clearer management frameworks.

The situation in the 4 authorities

All 4 of the authorities in the present study had a fair proportion of advisers or inspectors who had been in the service for a considerable time and had joined at a time when training was not considered necessary for advisers, so that many of the items in the questionnaire had been learned on the job rather than learned through formal training. All 4 were providing some kind of induction for new advisers and inspectors and had days when the whole team came together to be updated on the latest developments. All four also provided opportunities for advisers and inspectors to go to courses outside the authority.

Advisory teachers were the responsibility of a senior adviser in authorities B, C and D. In authority A they remained the responsibility of the chief adviser. These people provided induction in most cases and made some provision for updating. In authority C in particular, the various small teams of advisory teachers were led by advisory teachers who organised training for their colleagues. Training was also part of the responsibility of the adviser or inspector who was the line manager for each advisory teacher.

Advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers were asked how many courses outside the authority they had attended since January 1991 (questionnaires went out during the summer and early autumn of 1992). In authority A inspectors had attended 2.7 courses each and advisory teachers 2.9. In authority B the numbers were 1.5 for advisers and 2.7 for advisory teachers. Authority C’s advisers had attended 1.4 courses each and advisory teachers 1.7. Advisers in authority D had attended 2.4 courses, inspectors 3.1 and advisory teachers 3.5.

The questionnaires also asked about appraisal. Inspectors in authority A and advisers in authority C were all part of an appraisal scheme and had all been appraised. In authority B a scheme was in the process of being worked out and 73% of advisers said they were part of a scheme and 36% had been appraised. In authority D 86% of advisers said they were in a scheme and 86% had been appraised. The figures for inspectors were 85% and 77%.

Fewer advisory teachers had been appraised and in authority B there was no scheme which covered them at the moment which is interesting when we consider that this authority
generally had high scores for advisory teachers. In authority A 82% said they were part of scheme and 35% said they had been appraised. Only 12% of authority C’s advisory teachers said they were part of a scheme and only 8% had been appraised. Authority D’s advisory teachers had 67% who were part of a scheme and 50% who had been appraised but it will be remembered that this authority had a very small return from advisory teachers.

The questionnaire survey

This chapter is concerned with the following questions:

1. What training (formal or informal) have advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers had for their work?
2. Is the training experience of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers in these 4 authorities similar to the statements of provision listed in the national survey (Dean 1991b)
3. Is there a relationship between formal training and headteachers’ and teachers’ views of advice and support and teacher development.

The background to the questionnaire

This section of the study differs from the rest in that criteria on training which could be used for the questionnaire did not emerge from the accounts of effectiveness (cf. pp. 67,68). The items were therefore taken from a national study by Dean (1991b). This study had an 86% return and provided a national picture against which the results of this study can be seen.

Advisers’ views on training

Advisers were asked to say whether they had had ‘satisfactory training’, ‘some training’ or ‘little or no training’ and whether they ‘would like training’ in the particular item. The scores are summarised in the fold out table on page 347. The questionnaires show low scores for the majority of items. This is partly because people were asked about their own experience and many joined before training was seen to be necessary for advisory staff. In a number of cases there were comments that this had changed and that there was now training provided. Sixty five per cent of the scores for advisers and inspectors come into the ‘poor’ category and only 6% of the scores come into the ‘good’ category. The average scores are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>1.87 for advisers 1.66 for inspectors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADVISERS' AND INSPECTORS' VIEWS OF TRAINING

Fig. 16.1

AUTHORITY A

AUTHORITY B

AUTHORITY C

AUTHORITY D

T1 Induction programme - introduction to the LEA
T2 Induction programme - introduction to advisory work
T3 Work on inter-personal skills e.g. discussion leadership
T4 Selection interviewing
T5 Work on different aspects of the inspection of schools
T6 Report writing
T7 Consideration of what is involved in supporting headteachers
T8 Consideration of what is involved in working with governors
T9 Consideration of ways of supporting teachers
T10 Training in management skills
T11 Training in the skills of running in-service education
T12 Provision of opportunities for updating knowledge
T13 Training in personal organisation e.g. the use of time
Authority A has the highest score for 5 items and the lowest score for one with 7 poor scores and one good score. Authority B has the highest score for 5 items and the lowest score for one with 6 poor items and 2 good ones. Authority C has the lowest score for 7 items with poor scores for 11 items and no good scores. Authority D advisers have the highest score for 2 items and the lowest score for one with 7 poor scores and one good score. The inspectors have the lowest score for 3 items and 11 items in the poor category.

Authority A's highest score is for 'Provision of opportunities for updating knowledge' (2.67) and their lowest scores are for 'Induction programme - introduction to the LEA' (1.44) and 'Training in the skills of running in-service education' (1.33).

Authority B has good scores for 'Induction programme - introduction to the LEA' (2.54) and 'Induction programme - introduction to advisory work' (2.54). Their lowest score is for 'Training in personal organisation' (1.44).

Authority C's highest score is for 'Report writing' (2.14) and their lowest scores are for 'Induction programme - introduction to the LEA' (1.11) and 'Induction programme - introduction to advisory work' (1.21).

Authority D's advisers' highest score is for 'Provision of opportunities for updating knowledge' (2.57) and their lowest scores are for 'Induction programme - introduction to the LEA' (1.33) and 'Report writing' (1.33). This second score is not surprising since advisers are not expected to write reports in the same way as inspectors but the inspectors have a score of only 1.50 for this item. Their highest score is for 'Work on different aspects of the inspection of schools' (2.31) and their lowest score is 'Training in personal organisation' (1.42).

The items scoring best overall are 'Work on different aspects of inspecting schools' which has only one poor score but no good ones; 'Report writing' which has poor scores from both groups in authority D but satisfactory scores from the other authorities and 'Provision of opportunities for updating knowledge' which has 2 good scores and one poor score.

The weakest item is 'Training in the skills of running in-service education' where every score is a poor one. The following items have 4 poor scores out of the 5: 'Induction programme - introduction to the LEA'; 'Induction programme - introduction to advisory work'; 'Work on inter-personal skills'; 'Selection interviewing'; 'Consideration of what is involved in supporting headteachers'; 'Consideration of what is involved in working with governors' and 'Training in management skills'.

The views of advisory teachers on training
Advisory teachers were asked similar questions to those for advisers and their score summary can be seen in the fold out table. Sixty nine per cent of the scores come into the poor category and only 8% of the scores come into the good category. The averages were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADVISORY TEACHERS' VIEWS OF TRAINING

Fig. 16.2

AUTHORITY A

AUTHORITY B

AUTHORITY C

AUTHORITY D

T1 Induction programme - introduction to the LEA
T2 Induction programme - introduction to advisory work
T3 Work on inter-personal skills e.g. discussion leadership
T9 Consideration of ways of supporting teachers
T10 Training in management skills
T11 Training in the skills of running in-service education
T12 Provision of opportunities for updating knowledge
T13 Training in personal organisation e.g. the use of time
Authority A had none of the highest scores and 4 of the lowest scores. All but one of their scores were poor and there were no good scores. Authority B had the highest score for one item which was a good score. The remaining scores were all poor. The scores included 2 scores of one which meant that the advisory teachers in that group had had no training at all under that particular item. Authority C had the highest score for one item but this was still a poor score. They had none of the lowest scores but six of the 8 scores were poor. Authority D had the highest scores for 6 items and the lowest score for none. They had 2 good scores and 2 poor scores.

Authority A's highest score was for 'Provision of opportunities for updating knowledge' (2.29). Their lowest scores were for 'Induction programme - introduction to advisory work' (1.12) and 'Training in personal organisation *' (1.12).

In authority B the highest score was for 'Training in the running of in-service education' (2.75). The lowest scores were for 'Work on inter-personal skills' (1.00) and 'Training in management skills' (1.00).

Authority C had their highest score for 'The induction programme - introduction to advisory work *'(2.21). Their lowest score was for 'Training in management skills' (1.54).

Authority D did best and their highest score was for 'Provision for updating knowledge' (2.67). Their lowest score was for 'Induction programme - introduction to the LEA' (1.80).

'Induction programme - introduction to the LEA' had poor scores from all authorities as did 'Training in management skills'. The best scoring item was 'Provision of opportunities for updating knowledge' which had one good score and only one poor score.

Overall view of the scores for training
No item in this questionnaire did well. The best item which had 3 good scores and only 2 poor scores was for 'Provision of opportunities for updating knowledge' which is not very surprising given the present rate of change. One might, in fact, expect it to score more highly. Advisers also have only one poor score for inspection but no good scores and report writing where again there are no good scores but only 2 poor scores. These again are not very surprising areas given the pressure for inspection since the Education Reform Act. It is perhaps surprising that authority D inspectors with a separation of advice and inspection score only 1.50 on report writing.

'Induction programme - introduction to the LEA' has poor scores for all but one authority for advisers. This is authority B which has a good score for this item. 'Work on inter-personal skills' has poor scores for all but authority D advisers and advisory teachers. 'Consideration of what is involved in working with governors' has poor scores for all but authority D advisers and 'Training in management skills' has poor scores for all but authority A advisers.
### TABLE OF SCORES FOR INSPECTOR, ADVISER AND ADVISORY TEACHER TRAINING

#### Fig. 16.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>T7</th>
<th>T8</th>
<th>T9</th>
<th>T10</th>
<th>T11</th>
<th>T12</th>
<th>T13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D Adv Insp</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores in this table are the average scores per item.

**Bold type** indicates the highest score for that item in the questionnaire.

**Italic** indicates the lowest score for that item in the questionnaire.

**Underlined** indicates scores of 2.50 or above.

**Rectangle outline** indicates scores below 2.00.

- **T1** Induction programme - introduction to the LEA
- **T2** Induction programme - introduction to advisory work
- **T3** Work on inter-personal skills e.g. discussion leadership
- **T4** Selection interviewing
- **T5** Work on different aspects of the inspection of schools
- **T6** Report writing
- **T7** Consideration of what is involved in supporting headteachers
- **T8** Consideration of what is involved in working with governors
- **T9** Consideration of ways of supporting teachers
- **T10** Training in management skills
- **T11** Training in the skills of running in-service education
- **T12** Provision of opportunities for updating knowledge
- **T13** Training in personal organisation e.g. the use of time
Comparison with the national picture

The national study (Dean 1991b) gave the percentages of authorities offering each of the items in the list. Three items were added to this list for advisers and inspectors in the questionnaires sent out. They were:

- Selection interviewing
- Report writing
- Consideration of what is involved in working with governors

### COMPARISON OF NATIONAL FIGURES FOR PROVISION OF TRAINING WITH TRAINING EXPERIENCED BY ADVISERS, INSPECTORS AND ADVISORY TEACHERS IN THE FOUR AUTHORITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T7</th>
<th>T9</th>
<th>T10</th>
<th>T11</th>
<th>T12</th>
<th>T13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National percentages</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 4 authorities</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D Adv</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D Insp</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T7</th>
<th>T9</th>
<th>T10</th>
<th>T11</th>
<th>T12</th>
<th>T13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National percentages</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 4 authorities</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The national figures are the percentages of authorities offering training in each particular area. The figures for the authorities are the percentages of adviser/inspectors/advisory teachers who have experienced training in each area.

- T1 Introduction to the LEA
- T2 Introduction to advisory work
- T3 Inter-personal skills
- T5 Inspection
- T7 Supporting headteachers
- T9 Supporting teachers
- T10 Management skills
- T11 In-service education
- T12 Up-dating knowledge
- T13 Personal organisation
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The national survey list for advisory teachers included ‘supporting headteachers’ but in view of the very low score for this item it was omitted from the questionnaire.

The national figures suggested that LEAs did not think it as important to train advisory teachers as advisers. Yet advisory teachers usually come from more junior posts and since they are normally seconded they need to learn quickly. It could be argued that they have greater need for training than advisers. On the other, training for advisers makes long term provision since they normally stay in post for some time. The national figures also suggest that LEAs see advisers dealing with headteachers more than teachers and advisory teachers dealing with teachers more than headteachers. The actual experience of the advisory teachers in the 4 authorities does not show a similar difference to the national survey between the scores of advisers and inspectors and those of advisory teachers.

Advisers and inspectors, apart from advisers in authority B, did not have a comparable experience of induction to that in the national figures but advisory teachers did. This was probably because many came before training was usual. Another area where advisers’ and inspectors’ actual experience of training was less than that in the national figures was in-service education but advisory teachers had more training in this area than the national figures suggested. One area where there was considerably more training than the national figures give was in updating knowledge, which is not very surprising given the changes that are happening in the education field. There was also more training of advisers and inspectors for inspection and more training for advisory teachers in management skills than the national figures give.

A correlation of the figures for the training experienced by advisers and inspectors and by advisory teachers with those for the national provision show a small negative correlation which does not reach significance.

Comparison of training scores with those for the key areas.
The training scores for advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers were correlated with those for headteachers and teachers for advice and support and for in-service education. None was significant and all but the correlation for in-service education and training were small but negative.

Training which inspectors, advisers and advisory teachers would like
All groups were asked to note items in which they would like training. Their numbers are shown in the table on the next page. It is interesting to note that there was more interest in training in authority C than in the other authorities, but no authority had a very substantial number of people wanting training in any particular area. This could be because they feel their training needs have been satisfied informally and formally.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorities</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1 Induction programme - introduction to the LEA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 Induction programme - introduction to advisory work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3 Work on inter-personal skills e.g. discussion leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4 Selection interviewing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5 Work on different aspects of the inspection of schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6 Report writing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7 Consideration of what is involved in supporting headteachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8 Consideration of what is involved in working with governors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9 Consideration of ways of supporting teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10 Training in management skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11 Training in the skills of running in-service education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12 Provision of opportunities for updating knowledge</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13 Training in personal organisation e.g. the use of time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on training

Thirty seven comments were made about training by advisers and 23 by advisory teachers. A number of comments were explanations that the writer had not experienced training but things were better now:

My answers to 1 and 2 (induction to LEA and advisory work) reflect my experience when I joined the LEA in 1984. I am pleased to say that the situation has now changed for the better.

_Inspector, authority A_

The situation has changed during the 17 years I have been in post.

_Inspector, authority A_

Changed situation (over training) over the last 2 years.

_Adviser, authority D_

The situation has changed in the LEA. Seven years ago there was no induction for me - I learnt the job by doing it. Now an induction programme, including mentors, applies.

_Inspector, authority D_
A number of people commented on the value of learning on the job:

At the time I joined the advisory service there were very few advisory teachers. Although there was no formal induction or training programme, the informal 'on the job' training with colleague advisers worked well.

*Advisory teacher, authority C*

'Training' is a very unhelpful concept - most learning has taken place on the job with supportive criticism from colleagues. This might be better structured but is infinitely more effective than courses.

*Adviser, authority C*

I would see training in its least formal but probably most effective sense i.e. that of reflecting on practice and evaluating it with colleagues. Most of my training has come either in this form or by way of experience in providing INSET for others.

*Adviser, authority C*

Some people felt that they had acquired the necessary skills in a previous post and needed no further training:

Although new to the advisory service I have had the opportunity to develop many of the above mentioned skills in my previous job and in my studying for an MA in school management.

*Advisory teachers, authority A*

Induction training not applicable as I came to the authority from another advisory post. Secondly many skills and abilities acquired in previous posts, so this post is more an exercising and extending of my skills and abilities.

*Advisory teacher, authority D*

There were a number of people who had received training from sources outside the advisory team because of the particular job they were doing:

The training I received was organised by NCET (National Council for Educational Technology) for advisory teachers (IT - information technology). I have never received training from the LEA.

*Advisory teacher, authority D*

I received training in assertiveness and presentation as part of my LINC (Language in the National Curriculum) training. This was not part of LEA provision.

*Advisory teacher, authority A*

A few people were complimentary about the training and support they had received:

The professional development of inspectors has much improved since the appointment of our chief inspector in 1989.

*Inspector, authority A*

The induction last year and this year has been very well thought out to meet the needs of advisory teachers.

*Advisory teacher, authority D*

I have been very fortunate in my experience as a curriculum development teacher, re-line management, I have felt supported and valued.

*Advisory teacher, authority B*
Others were critical:

The team is not in any corporate sense deciding its needs and cannot therefore support individual development although the majority are supportive people.

_Inspector, authority D_

Appraisal prior to 1992 fairly benign and not professionally helpful. Supposedly new scheme still not really in operation, still benign and lacking any rigour in terms of principles, objectives and outcomes.

_Inspector, authority D_

I find the question difficult since training is provided in aspects of the work but it’s not necessarily very good or appropriate to the present position of LEAs or my personal position. The training is continually being overtaken by events.

_Adviser, authority C_

Several other people made the point that training is being overtaken by events:

The last 3 years has been a period of constant and in some cases radical change. LEAs have spent much time maintaining the status quo/equilibrium.

_Adviser, authority C_

Much is evolving at present and it is difficult to say that the response is positive as it appears but meetings and discussions indicate that much is coming to be clarified.

_Inspector, authority D_

The rapidly changing nature of our work in the future has made the task of having a long term training project somewhat difficult.

_Inspector, authority D_

**Evidence from interviews**

Seventy six comments altogether were made about training by advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers. Twelve of these were made by inspectors and advisory teachers from authority A, 11 came from authority B, 23 from authority C and 30 from authority D.

All 4 authorities had a formal programme of in-service education for advisers and inspectors.

We’re engaged at the moment in an on-going programme of colleagues presenting to us their National Curriculum picture - the way things are developing. Recently we had a whole morning with … our humanities adviser and history and geography, the way that’s shifted. We’ve had a session on mathematics. We’ve had a session on religious education - the Agreed Syllabus, so that is all part of it. … It’s probably worth mentioning too that within that conference primary advisers were paired a with a subject adviser in terms of developments within that subject.

_Senior adviser, authority B_

**Q** How have you found the CAID (Centre for Adviser and Inspector Development) package?

**A** Well the principal focus for us has been the classroom observation leading towards inspection. It provided a vehicle for people to work - for the team to come together on a shared agenda and I think colleagues put a lot of time and effort into it.

_Senior inspector, authority B_
We have planned non-contact days for professional development. We’ve got the residential, the senior staff conference days as well and ... also that series of courses to do with things like time management. 

Adviser, authority D

The initial experience in the first few weeks of the new job was I thought very, very good and I felt very conscious of a group of people round about me who were trying to help me and get me sorted out, organised into what I was doing. I was very grateful for that. 

Inspector, authority D

I think our experiences were very variable depending on when you started. For us, I was one of the more recent members to join and it was really well planned and well thought out and new people coming from other authorities were very, very impressed with what we actually did, but maybe people who joined a year before would not have the same feelings because it has changed. 

Adviser, authority D

There was a strong feeling that the informal opportunities were important:

The kind of development I’ve been on over the years have actually been sort of induction for all inspectors - time management, all of which have been superb learning experiences, but I think when we get together and have a residential couple of days thrashing out whatever, there’s a lot of professional development within those conferences.

Inspector, authority A

I went into link review I suppose in the same way as everybody else with a great deal of trepidation and not knowing what on earth I was doing and I’ve enjoyed it. I never look forward to them and then I suddenly surprise myself at the end of the day that it’s been a quite fascinating day and I’ve learned a lot. I’ve learned a lot about myself and about the colleagues I’ve worked with. I’ve learned a lot about the school. I’ve learned more in a day on a link review about a school than I could ever learn in 3 or 4 visits. It’s not enough. It gives you a focus, a very clear focus.

(NB Link review is a one day review of the school where the adviser has a general role) 

Adviser, authority C

I’ve learned a lot, a tremendous amount as a general adviser in the past 3 years. ... So I’ve gained a lot from the job and my feeling is that (this has been ) professional development experience. ... But beyond that I’ve had no professional development opportunity at all, apart from that provided as being part of the advisory team. I’ve not had any individual professional development at all. ... It was turned down. 

Adviser, authority C

When I look back over 3 years I’ve learned more in 3 years than I’ve ever learned in any 3 years in my professional life before but I don’t feel that professional development with a capital P and a capital D is answerable or provided. I don’t think the opportunities have necessarily been made, certainly not for me. 

Adviser, authority C

I came from secondary schools and I’ve been an advisory teacher and there I gathered lots of curriculum expertise and it was at the time when the National Curriculum was coming in and that was an enormous learning curve and then moving into being an adviser was absolutely amazing, mind boggling. And I must say that because I came from the background I did, I hadn’t got certain skills. I hadn’t been a head. I wouldn’t say that I’d got management skills. I’d managed myself. I’d managed the work, things like that and I still feel an inadequacy there. I’ve been on some courses, but they’re mainly to do with my curriculum area and that’s been my strength in that I could say ’Right my expertise is there’ and that’s quite comforting .... But in terms of other people being supportive, people I’ve worked with and in particular ... the adviser at that time was amazingly supportive and I’ve learnt a tremendous amount from him. And then through working with other people. It’s an amazing learning curve. 

Adviser, authority C
I think one of the best professional development facilities I’ve had actually in the first year was that I was included on a middle school inspection and I found that enormously beneficial.

_Inspector, authority D_

I had the same induction experience, despite the fact that I had been a head in the authority, the three weeks of finding one’s feet was absolutely superb. I actually had time to read things, something I hadn’t experienced in my years as a head. And also the first 2 inspections I went into were completely outside my phase and I went into a nursery school and I was actually led through every detail. It was absolutely superb. I was with a very experienced inspector who talked me through everything. The second I was in a lower school, also outside my experience. I was given great insights there by 2 colleagues on how to go about searching out sources of data and how to make use of them and it may have been just my luck that the 2 people who were with me on both occasions made sure that they led me personally through all those areas involved.

_Inspector, authority D_

The experience of advisory teachers appeared to be varied. Some had a very good experience and some in-service work was organised by teams of advisory teachers for their members. Three of the authorities had a senior adviser in charge of provision for advisory teachers who was responsible for their training.

Q What sort of the thing do your advisory teachers - your curriculum support teachers, you call them, don’t you - what sort of thing do they get?

A It depends on the area.... A teacher coming from high school would work in the first year within a training programme and would really take up a great deal of work in the second year, but that’s very different for somebody who ... has good primary practice who can go out and work straight away.

B But there’s a formal programme for them which a senior adviser responsible for them organises. ... One of the concerns about those posts was being aware of the developments in assessment and another concern was getting up to date broadly with the National Curriculum.

C We were concerned that they shouldn’t be disadvantaged when they go back to their schools by not being aware of changes and additionally by more subtle changes.

_Advisers, authority B_

Q What sort of training have you had as advisory teachers, either induction or on the job?

A We’ve had a lot of things. We’ve had each year an induction programme which has got better. I think the one that’s planned for this year is even better. ... That’s been a key part of the job. It’s not been about curriculum, it’s been about the skills and awarenesses necessary to do the job of an advisory teacher. Then we had a programme of INSET built in which (has) ranged from regular curriculum meetings of people with specialisms to 3 team meetings which have looked at particular curriculum areas and had specialist input where necessary, either from the advisory teachers on the team or from someone else. We had a programme of assessment support from ... an outside trainer. ... All targeted at the roles that we have but it’s certainly been very supportive of us in terms of teams.

_Advisory teacher, authority C_

We do, as a team (of advisory teachers) run INSET for anybody who joins the team and that’s actually quite intensive. If we have somebody new coming in, we don’t let them out into schools until we’ve worked with them for a period of time because it’s crucial that they’re not going out saying, you know, all sorts of things. We do have to be speaking with the same voice a bit.

_Advisory teacher, authority D_
Line managers played an important part in the training of advisory teachers in some authorities:

Q  What about informal professional development. I mean to what extent do your line managers help with your professional development?

A  Mine does, certainly. Everything I've done she questions me about, 'What did you learn from that etc?' every time we settle down.

B  Yes. I think you are quite fortunate in that your line manager is also the subject inspector. Many of us don't have line managers who know as much about our subject as we do - are most of us in that situation?

Advisory teachers, authority A

Some advisory teachers felt that they needed to organise their own training because this was the best way to get it:

It's been for me to identify what I feel I need for my own professional development but I've never been denied any application to a course or any in-service opportunity. ... I feel it's been entirely up to me. I feel it’s been up to me to make the best of any experiences that have been available and the authority's been very supportive.

Advisory teacher, authority C

I hadn't any experience of primary schools when I started as an advisory teacher and what I did to begin with, well I was working with another advisory teacher and we both decided to get... into primary and we rang up and said could we come in and observe and get involved and that really helped.

Adviser, authority C

I'm not sure I've actually had any professional training as an advisory teacher. It's evolved through experience, working with other colleagues, trying things out, finding ways that aren't successful, observing colleagues that are performing very effectively. That's how the professional development has been... very much towards the curriculum area.

Advisory teacher, authority C

Authority D was asking its members to set out a personal development plan as part of the appraisal process:

There are people, there are very, very caring people in the inspection and advice service who would give advice and have given me advice which has pushed me in directions that I may not have considered and so I think this PDP (Personal Development Plan) ... will offer that opportunity.

Advisory teacher, authority D

There was some concern about the problems of keeping up with the many papers which were coming from the government and being sent directly to schools:

Q  Are there any aspects of training that you would like?

A  would like to have had some training on some of the things which are happening in school, like appraisal, like LMS (Local Management of Schools)in a bit more depth. We were given a cursory overview of it rather than anything in depth. Those issues have gone now but there are things going on in schools that I don’t know about and I will want to go back into school one day.
B I agree with that. We should be given equal access to new initiatives in school.

C Because the schools actually think we've had it...They say, 'Of course you knew all about' - or I'm picking something off the staffroom table which I ought to know about and don't.

Adviser, authority B

One adviser in authority A brought out the problem that advisers in small authorities have in that they have to take responsibility for more than one subject but have difficulty in getting to courses in all the subjects for which they are responsible.

If you have 2 or 3 subjects to look after you can't attend all the training you would like to in relation to those subjects. I suppose I tend to - I always go to my own association, my own area, my own training area, which I think is the one I least need but I contribute to as well as receive training.

Inspector, authority A

It could be concluded from this evidence that a good deal more training was taking place in the 4 authorities than the replies to the questionnaires indicated. A good deal of this was informal learning by working with colleagues. Nevertheless, the overall impression was that there was a lack of structure to what was happening and these authorities, probably because of the pressure they were currently working under, would seem to need a more systematic approach which brought together the formal and informal programmes and matched them to individual need.

Summary

Findings in relation to the questions asked

1 Adviser, inspectors and advisory teachers in these 4 authorities have had a limited amount of formal training but many have had satisfactory informal training through working with colleagues and discussing and evaluating work.

2 The experience of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers in these 4 authorities does not correlate with the figures for provision given in the national survey (Dean 1991b). In some cases there is more training and in others less.

3 The scores for training do not correlate with those for advice and support or teacher development.

Other findings

1 A limited number of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers wanted additional training in the areas listed. There were more advisers wanting training in authority C than in the other authorities and this links with the fact that authority C advisers had low scores in the questionnaire.
2  A number of respondents who had been in post some time noted that they had not received training but things had now changed and a programme was in place.

3  A good deal of informal training was taking place in all 4 authorities and people found this very satisfactory.

4  The constant changes could make training inappropriate very quickly. It was difficult to set up programmes which were useful.

5  Line managers had an important development role for advisory teachers but advisory teachers in a small authority may not have the benefit of a line manager with a comparable specialism.

6  Advisers and inspectors in small authorities who have to be responsible for more than their own specialist subject have difficulty in deciding what outside courses they should attend.

7  There is a good deal of training taking place in the 4 authorities but there would seem to be a need for it to be more structured so that it is a better match for individual need.
17 CONCLUSIONS

There are six main pieces of research which concern the local authority advisory service. Bolam (1978), Winkley (1985), Stillman and Grant (1989), The Audit Commission (1989), Maychell and Keys (1993) and Nixon and Rudduck (1993). Of these, Bolam, Stillman and Grant and the Audit Commission are basically studies of how advisory services were organised and how they worked at the time the studies were made. The present study updates some of the information in these researches, mainly in chapter 5, which is the study of what is happening nationally, but also in chapter 12 which reviews the experience and qualifications of advisers in the present study, updating some of the information in Bolam’s study.

Winkley (1985) studied the management styles of 4 authorities and the resulting effectiveness of the advisory teams. He found that the most effective team as far as the schools were concerned was one which had no chief adviser, left advisers largely to their own devices and valued good relationship highly. By contrast the team which had a chief inspector and was in a strong position managerially within the authority was less effective in the view of schools.

The present findings are in contrast with Winkley’s findings in that the most effective authority in the view of schools in this study was authority A which had strong leadership and was well managed, although this was not necessarily the only reason why they appeared to schools to be effective. They also had a high ratio of advisers to schools which may have been an important factor.

Maychell and Keys (1993) and Nixon and Rudduck (1993) studied the way in which local authorities were setting up their inspection programme. Maychell and Keys (p.59) found that headteachers, writing of local authority inspections, appreciated ‘the positive atmosphere which the inspection team had created, the objectivity and impartiality of the team, the opportunity to engage in future planning and the useful advice, information and ideas given by inspectors’ They also found that most heads valued their advisory service and were concerned that advisers were unable to provide the service they were used to. The national survey in this study shows that the situation is now worse than when these studies were carried out and confirms the fact that headteachers are finding advisory services less able to give the service they had enjoyed in the past. Authority A in this study was an exception to this. Headteachers in this authority felt that the way the advisory service was now run was resulting in a much more effective service than in the past.

Nixon and Rudduck (1993) found that at its best the local authority inspection service was sensitive in its grasp of local factors, rigorous in its gathering and sifting of evidence and punctilious in its reporting procedures.

The present study found that most of the schools which had been inspected by local teams were happy with what happened and felt that they had gained from the experience.
although the scores for inspection related activities were in the satisfactory class rather than the good class except for authority A which had an average score of 2.69. The one school where there was dissatisfaction was deliberately included to give a contrast. In this respect this study confirms the findings of Maychell and Keys and Nixon and Rudduck.

The evidence

The preceding chapters provide a good deal of evidence about the effectiveness of the advisory services in the 4 authorities studied. The value of this depends upon its validity, reliability and the extent to which it is representative of work in similar authorities.

The validity of the questionnaire material was discussed in chapter 4 (cf p.81). This arises from the way the questionnaires were compiled using examples of effectiveness given by users and members of the service. It was also explained in chapter 3 (cf. p.49) that the questionnaires had been compiled so that it would be possible to do a split-half test (Spearman-Brown) correlating the scores for alternate questions which had been designed so that each pair of questions were very similar. A 10% sample of the responses from headteachers and teachers and a 12.5% sample of responses from advisers and advisory teachers was chosen by taking every tenth response in the headteachers’ and teachers’ questionnaires and every eighth response in the advisers’ and advisory teachers’ questionnaires. (A larger sample from advisers and advisory teachers was chosen because the size of the group was smaller). The result of this correlation was significant in all cases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire 1</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headteachers’ questionnaire 1</td>
<td>0.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headteachers’ questionnaire 1a</td>
<td>0.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headteachers’ questionnaire 2</td>
<td>0.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ questionnaire 1</td>
<td>0.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ questionnaire 2</td>
<td>0.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ questionnaires 1a and 2a</td>
<td>0.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisers’ questionnaires 1 and 2</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory teachers’ questionnaires 1&amp;2</td>
<td>0.609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Teachers’ questionnaires 1a and 2a and advisers’ and advisory teachers’ questionnaires 1 and 2 were put together because of the small number of questions in each.)

It can therefore be concluded that the questionnaires were reliable as well as valid.

The evidence from the interviews must be valid since it is the direct result of the experience of those being interviewed. Its reliability depends upon the extent to which the evidence of one group confirms that of another. There are a number of findings where there is considerable consensus. (e.g. findings on credibility cf. pp. 166,172,173,200,203)

There remains the question of how representative the authorities chosen are of authorities as a whole. There are several pieces of factual evidence which bear on this.
Authority A is one of 11 (34%) London boroughs with a population under 200,000. It has a schools to advisers ratio of 5.1 and is fairly representative of the London boroughs where 22 (68%) have a ratio between 4.00 and 7.00 schools per adviser. Five London boroughs have a better ratio and 2 have a worse ratio. Information was not available for 3 authorities.

Authority B is one of 23 (64%) metropolitan boroughs with a population between 200,000 and 400,000. It has a staffing ratio of 8.4 which makes it one of 9 (25%) authorities with a ratio of between 7.00 and 9.00 schools per adviser. Ten metropolitan boroughs have a better ratio and 11 have a worse ratio. Information was not available for 6 authorities.

Authority C is one of 5 (14%) counties with a population between 800,000 and 1,000,000. It has a ratio of 9.7 schools per adviser and is one of 14 (39%) counties which have a ratio of between 8 and 11 schools per adviser. Thirteen counties have a worse ratio and 3 a better ratio. Information was not available for 6 counties.

In 1992 when these figures were taken, the London boroughs were better staffed than the metropolitan boroughs and both were better staffed than the counties. The counties would appear to have a greater need for good staffing in that advisers spend more time in travelling and larger teams require some members to spend time organising the work of others, but this is not the case. One might therefore expect that a London borough team would be more effective than a metropolitan borough team and both would be more effective than a county team. This sort of pattern emerges from this study though there may be other reasons for this.

Dean (1991b, p.7) found that 'just over half of the LEAs responding to the survey (of the organisation and training of advisory teams) now have an area organisation in which individuals or groups of inspectors/advisers are responsible for groups of schools.' Three of the four authorities in this study had an area organisation. The same survey found that 77% of authorities had some posts with a phase responsibility. This was the case in all 4 authorities.

The 4 authorities chosen were also chosen as representative of different types of authority - shire county, London borough, metropolitan borough and were varied in size, were situated in different parts of the country and represented different forms of organisation.

It would seem therefore that the authorities chosen were in many respects fairly representative of their types and that the findings of this study could have wider implications.

The four authorities

The findings

The graphs and the tables which follow on show how the 4 authorities have done in each of the sets of criteria.
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COMPARISON OF VIEWS ON AREAS OF WORK HEADTEACHERS AND ADVISORY TEACHERS

Fig. 17.2
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The fold out table on page 365 summarises all the average scores and should be read in conjunction with the information on this page. It shows clearly that authority A has done better on most average scores concerning its inspectors, with the best score for every set of criteria from headteachers, the best score for climate and organisation from inspectors but not for training, and the best scores for 4 out of the six items from teachers. Ten of the fifteen scores are good and only one is poor.

Authority A does less well where advisory teachers are concerned with the highest score for none of the items and the lowest score for one but 8 of the 15 scores are in the good category and only training has a poor score. Climate has a particularly good score of 2.80.

Authority B has the highest score for 2 items for its advisers - training in the view of advisers and philosophy in the view of teachers. It has the lowest score for 4 items. Six of the 15 scores are good and 2 are poor. However, it does better than the other authorities where advisory teachers are concerned with the highest score for every item in the 15 except one, that of training. It has already been explained that the scores from advisory teachers themselves, that is those for climate, organisation and training, are to be doubted because of the very small size of the sample (cf.p.80). However, the scores from headteachers and teachers remain very good and 10 of 15 scores are in the good category. One, that for training, is in the poor category.

Authority C has the highest score for only one item - relationships in the views of teachers and the lowest score for 4 items. Six of the 15 scores concerning advisers are in the good category and 3 are in the poor category. The scores for advisory teachers have none of the highest scores and 5 of the lowest, with 4 in the good category and 1 in the poor category.

Authority D's advisers have none of the highest scores and 2 of the lowest for advisers. Two scores are in the good category and one score is in the poor category. Inspectors in authority D also have none of the highest scores and 5 of the lowest. Two scores are in the good category and one is in the poor category. All but one of their scores are lower than those for advisers.

The scores of authority D for advisory teachers include the highest score for training but 7 of the lowest scores. However, 7 of their scores are good and none is poor.

Overall authority A does best on the scores for advisers and quite well on the scores for advisory teachers. Authority B does best on the scores for advisory teachers but rather less well for advisers where its scores are comparable for those of authorities C and D.
Fig 17.5

**TABLE OF AVERAGE SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key areas</th>
<th>Inspection</th>
<th>Advice</th>
<th>Tr. devt</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Knowledge etc</th>
<th>Climate</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores in this table are the average scores for each set of criteria.

**Bold** - the highest score for that set of scores

**Italic** - the lowest score for that set of scores

**Underlined** - Scores of 2.50 or above

**Surrounding rectangle** - Scores below 2.00
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This poses the interesting question of why authority A does better than the other authorities and why authority B does better for advisory teachers. The most obvious difference for authority A which has already been mentioned (cf.p.105) is the high ratio of advisory staff to schools. The ratio of inspectors to schools is 5.1 per school. If advisory teachers are added to the number, the ratio is 1.8. This compares with a ratio of 8.4 advisers per school in authority B, 9.7 per school in authority C and 9.4 in authority D. This makes it possible for inspectors and advisory teachers in authority A to spend more time in individual schools.

There are also other differences, however. Authority A has exceptionally high scores from inspectors on climate and organisation. - averages of 2.92 and 2.86 respectively. These are higher than those of other authorities in both cases, but in the case of organisation the score is considerably higher. Comparable scores from the other authorities are 2.39 - authority B, 1.97 - authority C, 2.47 for authority D’s advisers and 2.28 for their inspectors. It was also evident from the questionnaires that all the inspectors were involved in planning, something that was possible because they were a small team.

Comments from headteachers in discussion suggest that this authority is particularly well led and well organised:

‘There’s been a real change in the way the inspectorate has operated in the last few years. There is a sense of work being managed and they have objectives and know where they are going.
Secondary school headteacher, authority A

There was also evidence of good leadership and organisation in authority A from the documentation provided which included planning documents to which everyone had contributed and from the comments made by headteachers and teachers (cf pp.320). It could therefore be argued that a high staffing ratio of advisers to schools plus good leadership are important elements in the effectiveness of an advisory service. On the other hand, climate and organisation do not correlate with advice and support and in-service education.

It is rather more difficult to know why the advisory teachers of authority B scored so well. The ratio of advisory teachers to schools (8.8 per school) is only marginally better than that of authority C (8.9 per school) and less good than those of authorities A (2.7 per school) and D.(6.1 per school). It was interesting to note that while the questionnaires from authority B included a number of comments which were critical of advisers, those about advisory teachers were all positive. There was some evidence from discussion with the chief adviser and advisers that the advisory teachers were more directed than in some other authorities. The chief adviser described the way their work was planned as follows:
We identify as an advisory team once a term at one of our meetings - we have a whole list of our schools and we have a history of which schools have had advisory teachers over the last 5 years. Specialist colleagues are the people to whom they are responsible and the primary or the specialist adviser will make a suggestion as to where the curriculum development teacher should be working next term. We work on half term modules in order to get through enough work and yet to have enough spread.

*Chief adviser, authority B*

The chief adviser also pointed out that they always appointed from within the authority and were careful to select people who had established themselves as able to lead other teachers.

In a similar way to authority A’s inspectors, authority B’s advisory teachers gave high scores for climate and organisation (3.00 and 2.89 respectively). However, it must be remembered that only 4 advisory teachers replied to the questionnaire whereas 89% of authority A’s advisory teachers replied.

The conclusion which could be drawn would seem to be that the advisory teacher service was most effective when much care was taken over appointments and when it was tightly programmed.

A further question which arises in considering the results from these 4 authorities was whether any particular form of organisation is more effective than any other. Authority C had a division between general and specialist advisers (cf. pp.323,324) and authority D a division between advisers and inspectors (cf. pp.175,176,287,300,307). The evidence from discussion in both cases was that both these forms of organisation had disadvantages and were not popular with advisers, although subject specialism was popular with teachers and headteachers.

One adviser in authority C which separated specialist and general advisers but were moving away from this form of organisation, described the problem that faced LEAs in providing both general and specialist advice:

> I guess most authorities have gone down the line of the general adviser with a specialism attached to them and I can’t see any other way round that. But it does create lots of problems in terms of the adequacy of support that can be given. They’re two separate responsibilities and when you’re talking about selling services you’ve got a real tension there.

*Specialist adviser, authority C*

Headteachers also felt that the provision of specialist advice was a problem.

> At a time when we’ve become very subject orientated, we’ve lost the expertise of the advisory service, because they ... have had to become general advisers.

*Primary school headteacher, authority C*

Authority D separated inspection and advice. This was liked by very few people. Advisers did not feel it to be a good idea:
I can't see how you can separate inspection from advice. I think they go hand in hand and you know, to make an artificial division between them when you're inspecting a school and when you're offering advice to a school is not very helpful.

Adviser, authority D

Inspectors felt that it led to confusion:

I think there's a great deal of confusion in schools about the difference in roles and people find it difficult to distinguish between an adviser and inspector even when an inspector has arrived for the job a good time after the division took place.

Inspector, authority D

Headteachers disagreed with the division:

I disagree with the separation (of inspection and advice). I think in the long term anyway the new arrangements for the inspection... to have a group of people registered, who actually spend all the time inspecting and they inspect a quarter of the schools in (the county) every year to get the 4 year cycle out, then I'm unhappy in the long term about their perceptions that they actually have in terms of the county as a whole (and) strategic movement nationally. I think schools have benefited more from advice than inspection. I mean the sort of big bang inspection that we've had in (this county) as in other midland authorities hasn't actually produced the results that advice to a particular curriculum area would have produced.

Secondary school headteacher, authority D

If an organisation with a division between inspection and advice had been more successful than one where advisers are involved in both activities, authority D might have been expected to perform particularly well in the separate activities of advice and inspection. In the event this was not the case. The average score for headteachers' views of inspection in authority D was 2.26 and for teachers' views 2.07. The average score for headteachers' views of advice and support was 2.08 and that for teachers 2.04. Authority D also did comparatively badly on the item on follow up to inspection, with a score of 1.67 which suggests that this becomes a problem when the two activities are separated. This finding is somewhat disturbing in the light of the proposals for inspection in the future.

A further finding from discussion about organisation was that the general adviser role was valuable once it was established. In authority A where the role was well worked out headteachers made comments such as the following:

My attached inspector proved invaluable during my initial induction to headship, due to the pastoral commitment, professionalism and counselling I have received. If the role was dramatically altered to one of purely inspectorial, then I would find it positively threatening and unsupportive.

Primary school headteacher, authority A

In authority C where the role was recently established there was less enthusiasm. There were some headteachers who found the role helpful but also headteachers who felt the change was a mistake. (cf. pp. 322,323)
There was also a certain amount of difference of opinion about area teams. Authority C in particular had established them fairly recently and it had taken time for them to settle down and become teams. However one newcomer was enthusiastic about the support the area team had offered:

As a newcomer I found the structures very helpful and initially being a member of a smaller team within one of the areas was particularly useful in terms of the initial induction process and having a network of people that I could quickly associate with and actually allow myself to get functional. I also found that the sort of procedures within the area team were quite clearly laid out for a newcomer. It was very apparent who your line manager was and what were the procedures you went through in the majority of cases to get things done.
Adviser, authority C

There was also some concern about consistency as between area teams (cf. p.324) but overall they and other small teams seemed to have a good deal to offer, particularly in supporting people. Membership of a small team allowed everyone to be involved in planning and evaluation and this appeared to them to make their work more effective.

The 4 authorities and the aims of advisory work
Chapter 1 set out a set of aims of advisory work. It is now possible to consider how well the 4 authorities met them:

1 To monitor, evaluate and report upon the quality of educational provision and the standards of learning and the implementation of local and national policy objectives.
All 4 authorities were doing this with varying degrees of success. Only authority A, in the views of headteachers, achieved a good average score for inspection and all the other scores were in the satisfactory category except for teachers' views of authority B where the average score was poor.

2 To provide the LEA with the information and advice needed to shape policy.
This was not part of this study.

3 To provide a coordinated programme of advice and support for all schools and other institutions, particularly in the implementation of the National Curriculum and in the management of resources.
None of the 4 authorities achieved an average score in the good category for advice and support and authority C had a poor score. However, authority A had a good score from headteachers and teachers for advisers and from teachers for advisory teachers for 'Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum.'
4 To promote the professional development of all staff.
All 4 authorities were providing professional development opportunities although the pressure on inspection was tending to make this a responsibility for advisory teachers rather than advisers. All the average scores were in the satisfactory category except that Authority A had a good score from headteachers for advisers and from teachers for advisory teachers. Authority B had good scores for advisory teachers from both headteachers and teachers.

5 To promote curriculum development, particularly in those areas not covered by the National Curriculum.
This was not investigated specifically but in authority A there were advisory teachers with responsibility for business studies, school industry links, health education and outdoor pursuits. In authority B there was an advisory teacher for health education. Authority C had advisory teachers for industry links and environmental education and authority D had advisory teachers for outdoor education, industry and education and personal, social and health education. It could therefore be argued that there was some promotion of areas not covered by the National Curriculum.

6 To offer advice and guidance on teaching appointments.
All 4 authorities provided this to some degree. Authority B tried to provide advice for as many appointments as possible, while the other authorities tended to keep advice for headships and the more senior posts.

7 To provide support and advice for the appraisal schemes of schools and colleges.
Authorities A and D had good scores for the item on appraisal in the headteachers’ questionnaire and authorities B and C had satisfactory scores.

8 To develop the work of the service and the individuals within it.
Development at the present time is being dictated by government policies with which all 4 authorities were coming to terms. In addition to substantial teacher development programmes in all 4 authorities, they all had some provision for training of advisers and advisory teachers but the investigation of this tended to give misleading results because this training tended to be of recent origin and advisers and advisory teachers who had been in post for some time had had on-the-job training only, though they felt that this was very valuable. All but advisory teachers in authority D had poor results from the questionnaire on training. It was clear that a good deal of training was actually taking
place in an informal way in all 4 authorities but it tended to be unsystematic.

It could therefore be concluded that all 4 authorities were meeting these aims to a certain extent but that there was room for improvement.

The research questions

This study set out to find the answers to a list of questions (cf. pp 73,74). The following answers were found:

1. What is effective advisory work?

This is discussed in detail in chapter 3. It was also discussed with groups of headteachers, advisers and advisory teachers and there are a number of quotations in other chapters about aspects of effectiveness. The following quotations are also relevant.

Several people saw advisory work as having an involvement with problem solving:

I think there's an element ... of winning respect by recognising the problem, not necessarily solving it, but recognising it, being prepared to debate it, talk it through, look for issues surrounding it that might be influential and to be able to come back at a future time and talk about progress.

Inspector, authority A

The first thing they do is listen and they listen positively. It's active listening or should be. The effectiveness is not that they go in with a solution for every issue that's being faced. The effectiveness as far as I am concerned is how do they enable an institution, a department or an individual to go forward, to develop, to take whatever it is that they're looking at, that step further. And in doing so effectiveness comes from helping people to solve their own problems if it's a problem or helping people to actually go forward, feeling that most of it is coming from themselves. I mean to me that is what one wants ideally to have an effective service.

Principal adviser, authority D

There was a concern with performance indicators:

There are other indicators about effectiveness that I would use in terms of both quantitative and qualitative ones. The quantitative things about the effectiveness would be how much demands people are in. Do I see them around, never out in schools and we do look at things like that. What do people say back in evaluation reports? How do they measure up when we go in and inspect schools? Is it true that those schools which have been working most closely with support teams, say in mathematics, are more likely to come out in the inspection, for example, as better than those schools that haven’t (had this opportunity). Do they make a difference?

Principal adviser, authority D

H.G.Wells said, 'I judge a man by what he leaves after him to grow.' Something I often think about is that if I was to leave at the end of this term and the work I am doing ceased, what would continue. What have I planted that will continue to grow?

Advisory teacher, authority A
At the end of the day, ... one's effectiveness is what the children are achieving.

*Advisory teachers, authority A*

People who 'll see things through once they agreed (a way forward) or taken it on board and deliver then what they say they're going to deliver.

*Secondary school headteacher, authority D*

There was a concern with the sort of person an effective adviser might be:

The effective adviser is one who knows the school and in whom you can have confidence that he or she knows what he or she is talking about. They should listen before advising. They should know staff. The work must be long term, built up over time. Confidence is important. Knowing in curriculum areas is less important. The head is concerned with people about people moving from advisory jobs. She feels they need an adviser as an anchor man.

*Notes from record of discussion with infant school headteacher, authority C*

Somebody who's sympathetic, communicates well, professional expertise, both particular and on the broader front and somebody who can listen.

*Secondary school headteacher, authority D*

2 What is the current situation of advisory teams in local authorities?

This is described in detail in chapter 5. There will be a cut of 18% in the number of advisers by September 1993 and a cut of 38% in the numbers of advisory teachers. The vast majority of authorities hoped to continue to provide support for schools as well as tendering for OFSTED (Office for Standards in Education) inspections. The majority of services would still be free to schools but some authorities were devolving the money to schools to buy back the services they felt they needed.

3 What are the priorities of headteachers and teachers for work by the advisory service?

These are described in detail in chapter 7. Headteachers give high priority to all aspects of inspection, including 'Helping the school to follow up the findings of inspection' and to 'Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum'. They give low ratings to advice on appointments, help in making the school development plan, providing reports on the work of teachers, advising on equipment and resources and on the design of new buildings.

Teachers give their highest rating to 'Making constructive comments' but also rate very highly all aspects of in-service work. 'Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum' is also highly rated. They give low ratings to 'Observing teachers at work in the classroom', 'Helping teachers to plan their work', 'Monitoring standards of learning and teaching' and 'Challenging situations'.
4 How do these compare with headteachers' and teachers' views of what is being offered?

This comparison is set out in graphic form in chapter 7 (cf. pp.116-119, 112,113, 132-135, 138-141). Headteachers rate authority A's inspectors at a level which compares well with headteachers' priorities with 19 scores at the same level as the priorities or above but this is not the case for the other authorities. Authority B has 4 items which are the same or above the level of the priority statements. Authority C has 10 and authority D has 5. Headteachers rate all the authorities at a rather similar level for advisory teachers with authority A having one score above the priority level, authority B, 2 scores, authority C, 3 scores and authority D one score.

Where teachers' views of advisers are concerned authority A has 5 scores which are the same or above the priority ratings, authority B has 2, authority C has 2 and authority D has 2.

Where teachers' views of advisory teachers are concerned, authority A has 2 scores at the same level or above the priority ratings, authority B has 4 such scores, authority C has 2 and authority D has 2.

Overall, with the exception of headteachers' views of authority A, the service these 4 authorities offer does not match up well to the priorities of their headteachers and teachers.

5 How do headteachers and teachers regard the inspections being conducted by local authority advisory teams?

This is explored in detail in chapter 8. Authority A is rated highly by headteachers and has good scores for all items. Authority C has good scores for 4 items and a poor score for one item. Authority D has one good score and one poor score and authority B has satisfactory scores throughout.

Where teachers' views are concerned there were no good scores. Authority A has satisfactory scores throughout. Authority B has 6 poor scores, authority C, one and authority D, 4.

Authority A might be regarded as doing well. The other authorities achieve a reasonable level with headteachers but not with teachers. This is perhaps not surprising given the evidence (cf. pp.166,167) that teachers find inspection very threatening. All 4 authorities have well worked out inspection schedules and appear to make good preparation for inspection. All 4 involve the schools in identifying some of the things they want the inspectors to look at so none of these matters make the difference between
authority A and the rest. Authority A appears to have a much clearer pattern of follow up to inspections than the other authorities and this may make a difference. The other possibility is that the small size of authority A and the good ratio of inspectors to schools may mean that the inspectors are better known in the schools and therefore less threatening than in the larger authorities where they may be less well known. A further relevant point was made by an inspector in discussion:

I think it’s inevitable that in-service will have to have changed and perhaps people’s attitudes as well because of the relevance of the in-service. Sometimes it’s linked with outcomes from inspection and that’s a relevant and significant link.

Inspector, authority A

6 How do headteachers and teachers regard the advice and help offered to them by local authority advisory teams?

This is discussed in detail in chapter 9. Headteachers give authority A’s inspectors 3 good scores and no poor scores. Authority B has one good score and 6 poor scores. Authority C has one good score and 3 poor scores and authority D has 1 good score and 7 poor scores.

Where headteachers’ views of advisory teachers were concerned, authority A has no good scores and one poor score; authority B has one good score and one poor score and authorities C and D have each no good scores and 2 poor scores.

Teachers’ views of advisers give authority A one good score and 4 poor scores; authority B no good scores and 5 poor scores; authority C no good scores and 8 poor scores and authority D no good scores and 4 poor scores.

Teachers views of advisory teachers are rather better than their views of advisers. Authority A has one good score and one poor score. Authority B has 5 good scores and one poor score. Authority C has no good scores and one poor score and authority D no good scores and 2 poor scores.

Overall these 4 authorities do not show up well in this major aspect of their work. Conversation in one school suggested that there had been a diminution in the advisory aspect of the work since the Education Reform Act because advisers were spending more time on inspections:

I’ve noticed that there aren’t so many visits in school now as there were 3 years ago and there were less 3 years ago than 5 years ago. We presume that is the changing role, because 4 years ago we would expect at least 6 people in per half term and before that probably more, but now it’s reduced and we don’t see them.

Primary school headteacher, authority B
Authority B has had no reductions in staff so this observation is most likely to be the result of a change in working patterns. If this is the reason for the poor showing where advice is concerned, it bodes ill for the future when the teams are reduced and even more concerned with inspection as well as with headteacher appraisal.

7 How do headteachers and teachers regard the provision for teacher development made by local authority advisory teams?
This is discussed in chapter 10. Headteachers give authority A good scores for 3 of the 4 items and a satisfactory score for the fourth. Authority B has 3 satisfactory scores and one poor score. They give authority C and both advisers and inspectors in authority D one good score and 3 satisfactory ones.

When it comes to headteachers' views of advisory teachers, authority A has 3 satisfactory scores, authority B, 2 good scores and one satisfactory one, authority C, one good score and 2 satisfactory ones and authority D, one poor score and 2 satisfactory ones.

Teachers give authority A advisers 4 good scores, authority B one good score, authority C 3 good scores, authority D advisers one good score and inspectors 2 good scores, one poor score. The rest of the scores are satisfactory.

Teachers' views of advisory teachers show authority B coming out particularly well with good scores for all items. Authority A has 7 good scores, authority C, 2 and authority D, 5. There are no poor scores.

Overall it might be said that teacher development in the 4 authorities is rather better than advice and support. This may be partly explained by the fact that advisers have largely moved into an organisational role with advisory teachers delivering the programme. Another explanation is that much more of the in-service programme is now responsive to individual requests from schools and many more courses are school based involving whole staffs. The following extract describes how the role has changed:

We're facilitators now, as I see it, through other people doing it for us if we've got advisory teachers or organising it in a different way if we haven't.

Inspector, authority A

8 How do headteachers and teachers view the educational philosophy and approaches of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers? Are they aware of the educational philosophy of these groups?
Chapter 11 explores this issue. It finds that headteachers and teachers are aware of the
educational philosophy of advisers and advisory teachers and tend to rate it highly. The scores for this aspect were much higher than those for advice and inspection.

Headteachers give authorities A and B good scores for all the items concerned with advisers in this section. Authority C have 5 out of 6 good scores, authority D advisers 4 good scores and authority D inspectors 5 good scores.

Headteachers’ scores for advisory teachers show authority B with 5 good scores out of 6 and authorities A, C and D with 4. There was one poor score.

Teachers give advisers in authorities A and B good scores for all items. Authority C has 4 good scores and one poor one. Authority D advisers have 2 good scores as have their inspectors.

Teachers’ scores for advisory teachers rate authority B very highly with good scores for all items. Authority A and authority D have each 4 good scores and authority C has 2 good scores and one poor one.

It is interesting to speculate as to why this area should score so highly. It suggests that when advisers get into the schools they make a good impression and use approaches which headteachers and teachers find very acceptable. Authorities A and B tend to score better than authorities C and D and this may be something to do with their better ratio of advisers to schools which allows them to spend more time with teachers and headteachers. Although authority B’s staffing ratio is considerably lower than that of authority A and only marginally better than that of authorities C and D, they appear to have taken on fewer inspections so that they have more time to get into schools. Authority B’s very good scores with advisory teachers, particularly from teachers, may reflect the tight organisation of this group which ensures that they spent the maximum time in schools.

Is there a relationships between these views and those held of the work of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers in the key areas of inspection, advice and support and teacher development?

Chapter 11 also looks at how the educational philosophy of advisers and advisory teachers relates to the key areas of inspection, advice and support and teacher development. Correlation of the scores with each of the key areas in turn shows no relationship between them and the educational philosophy of advisers and advisory teachers. This would seem to be a somewhat surprising finding. One would expect the philosophy of advisers and advisory teachers to affect their work in inspecting, advising and providing in-service education. It may be that the questions used to test educational philosophy and approaches did not really bring out this connection.
10 How do headteachers and teachers view the knowledge, skill and experience of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers?

Chapter 12 deals with the knowledge, skill and experience of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers. Scores are generally high in this area. Headteachers give good scores for all items to authorities A, B and C. Authority D advisers and inspectors each have 3 good scores out of 6. There are no poor scores.

Advisory teachers have 4 good scores from headteachers in authority A, all 6 good scores in authority B, 4 good scores in authority C and 3 in authority D. There are no poor scores.

Teachers give advisers in authority A good scores for all but one item, 3 good scores to authority B, 2 each to authority C and authority D advisers and 3 to authority D inspectors. There are no poor scores.

Both authorities A and B have all good scores from teachers for advisory teachers. Authority C have 3 good scores and authority D has 4. There are no poor scores.

These findings, like those for philosophy, suggest that headteachers and teachers have a high regard and expectation from their advisory services. Authorities A and B once again do better than authorities C and D probably for the reasons given under 8 above.

11 Is there a relationship between these views and those held of the work of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers in the key areas of inspection, advice and support and teacher development?

A correlation of the scores for knowledge, skill and experience with those for inspection, advice and teacher development shows them to be significantly related in all 3 cases. The relationship between knowledge, skill and experience and inspection was significant at a level between 5% and 2% and the relationships with advice and support and teacher development were both significant at the one percent level. This is very much the result one would expect since the knowledge, skill and experience of advisers and advisory teachers must affect the work they do in inspection, advice and support and teacher development.

12 How do headteachers and teachers view relationships with advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers?

Relationships were discussed in chapter 13. Here again scores are generally good. Authority A has all good scores from headteachers and authority B has good scores for all but one item. Authority C has 6 out of 8 good scores, authority D advisers have 5
Headteachers give authority B’s advisory teachers all good scores. Authority A has 5 out of 7 good scores as does authority C. Authority D has 4 good scores.

Teachers give authority A’s inspectors 5 out of 10 good scores. Authority B’s advisers also have 5 good scores. Authority C has 6 good scores. Authority D’s advisers have 5 good scores and inspectors have one good score and one poor score.

Teachers again rate authority B’s advisory teachers very highly, giving them good scores for all items. Authority A has good scores for 8 out of 10 items and authorities C and D have 6 good scores each. There are no poor scores.

Authority D’s inspectors score less well than their advisers throughout which no doubt reflects the attitude of schools to inspection rather than the ability of the inspectors to make good relationships. Overall one could conclude that relationships were good in all 4 authorities. Authorities A and B again appear to do better than authorities C and D, probably for similar reasons to those set out above under question 8 above.

13 Is there a relationship between these views and those held of the work of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers in the key areas of inspection, advice and support and teacher development.

Correlation of relationships with the key areas of inspection, advice and support and teacher development shows no relationship where inspection is concerned but a relationship significant at the 1% level for advice and support and at the 5% level for teacher development. One would expect a strong relationship for all the key areas but this again may be a matter of the questions that were asked about relationships. The lack of relationship with inspection may be due to the fact that some teachers appear to find inspection threatening (cf. pp. 166,167).

14 How far do advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers feel themselves to be part of a team culture and climate?

This question is discussed in detail in chapter 13. There were some difficulties about this because advisers and advisory teachers were uncertain whether the question referred to the whole advisory team or to the smaller teams to which some of them belonged. Most who were uncertain about this replied in terms of the smaller teams.

Scores are again very high. Authority A has all good scores from its inspectors with 4 of them scoring the maximum possible. Authority B also has all good scores with 3 of them scoring the maximum. Authority C has 4 out of 7 good scores. Authority D’s
advisers have all good scores with one maximum score and inspectors have 5 good scores.

The advisory teachers in authority B, which is a very small group, had maximum scores for every item and every authority had all good scores.

It can therefore be concluded that there is a strong feeling of team culture in all 4 authorities but it is uncertain how far this relates to the whole advisory team.

15 Is there a relationship between these views and those held of the work of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers in the key areas of inspection, advice and support and teacher development.

There was no significant correlation between climate and inspection but there was a significant correlation at the 5% level with advice and support and a highly significant correlation at 1% with teacher development.

16 How do advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers view the organisation and management of their teams?

This is discussed in detail in chapter 15. There are considerable differences between the authorities here which may go some way to explaining some of the earlier scores. Authority A has all good scores from its inspectors with 2 maximum scores. Authority B has 2 out of 9 good scores. Authority C has no good scores and 4 poor scores giving a poor average score. Authority D’s advisers have 6 good scores and one poor score and their inspectors have 3 good scores and one poor score.

Where advisory teachers are concerned authority B has good scores throughout with 5 maximum scores. Authority A has 4 good scores and one poor score. Authority C has satisfactory scores throughout and authority D has good scores throughout with 3 sets of maximum scores. However, it must be remembered that authorities B and D had poor returns from the questionnaires from advisory teachers and the samples are very small.

Overall these results suggest that authority A inspectors feel that they are well organised and managed and authority C’s advisers feel that they are not. Those of authorities B and D’s advisory teachers who replied to the questionnaire clearly feel that their organisation is good. Authority A has come out well in most areas and this may well be related to good organisation and management. Similarly authority B appears to come out well where advisory teachers are concerned and this too may be the effect of good management and organisation.
17 Is there a relationship between these views and those held of the work of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers in the key areas of inspection, advice and support and teacher development?

The correlation of organisation and inspection and organisation and advice and support shows no significant relationship. That for teacher development shows a correlation at a level between 5 and 10% which is not significant. This rather calls into question the statement above that the good organisation and management in authority A may be related to the good results from the inspectors in this authority in other areas.

18 What training (formal and informal) have advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers had for their work?

This is discussed in chapter 16. The results of this questionnaire were unsatisfactory in that many of those who replied had been in their teams for a long time and had joined at a time when training was not common. Several people commented that the situation had now changed and that there was now a training programme for all advisers and advisory teachers joining the service. This was the only area where results included a considerable number of poor scores. This confirmed the findings of the Audit Commission (1989) and the report by Stillman and Grant (1989) both of which found that training at that time was inadequate.

Authority A’s advisers give one good score and 7 poor scores out of 13 items. Authority B has 2 good scores and 6 poor scores. Authority C has 11 poor scores. Authority D’s advisers have one good score and 7 poor scores and the inspectors have 11 poor scores.

The advisory teachers in authority A have only one satisfactory score and the rest are poor. Authority B has one good score and the rest are poor. Authority C has 2 satisfactory scores and the rest are poor and authority D is the only authority with a satisfactory average. They have 2 good scores and only 2 poor scores.

19 Is the training experience of advisers, inspectors and advisory teachers in the 4 authorities studied similar to the statements of provision listed in the national survey (Dean 1991b)?

The results of the training experience of the advisers and advisory teachers in this survey did not relate to results of the national survey of training of 1991 which asked about provision of the same items of training as were included in the questionnaire in this study. This is probably explained by the fact that the survey was of provision and the questionnaires in this survey were concerned with the actual experience of advisers and advisory teachers.
Is there a relationship between formal training and headteachers and teachers' views of inspection, advice and support and teacher development?

In only one case, that of teacher development, is there any correlation between training and work in the key areas this is only at the 10% level which is not significant. This is almost certainly to be explained by the difficulty about this questionnaire outlined above.

### TABLE SHOWING LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE KEY AREAS AND OTHER AREAS

**Fig. 17.6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Educational philosophy</th>
<th>Knowledge, skill and experience</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Climate</th>
<th>Organisation and management</th>
<th>Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspection</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2% - 5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice and support</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher development</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other findings**

**Priorities**

1. 'Advising on provision for pupils with special needs' stood out as one item in which the performance of advisory teams was poorly rated in virtually every case, although authority D did rather better than the other authorities.

2. Teachers in particular rated the items on in-service education high in their priority list but there were some substantial differences between the priority and service scores on this topic for advisers and also in 2 authorities for advisory teachers.

3. Authority D, which had separated inspection and advice, generally did least well in the
comparisons and in particular scores showed large differences for activities which involved the follow up to inspection.

4 There was some evidence in discussion that headteachers would like more opportunities to discuss broader issues with advisers and inspectors.

5 A number of the comments by headteachers in particular were concerned with the relationships which advisers and advisory teachers were able to form with them and with teachers.

**Inspection**

1 Headteachers and teachers felt that inspection was a more valuable process when they were involved in discussing its focus and were able to link it with their own plans for the school. All 4 authorities aimed to do this.

2 Three of the 4 authorities involved lay people in their inspections. This did not appear to cause much concern to schools. Authority D involved a member of staff also and this was appreciated.

3 Teachers generally felt threatened by inspection. It became less threatening if they were given information about what was going to happen and if they knew the criteria by which judgements were being made. All 4 authorities spent time and care preparing schools for inspection and this was appreciated by headteachers and teachers but it could go wrong if the attitude of the inspector was not satisfactory.

4 Most teachers found it helpful to know when an inspector would be coming into their classroom. They appreciated the opportunity to discuss what they would be doing with the inspector before the lesson. The attitude of the inspector in the classroom was important. Inspectors who sat at the back with a clipboard tended to be intimidating. This affected children as well as teachers. Teachers appreciated it when pupils' work was thoroughly examined. They felt very strongly about the need for feedback after the lesson and for some comment as the inspector left the classroom. Teachers and particularly headteachers welcomed discussion of wider issues. There was a strain in having inspectors in the school and this was enhanced if the inspector spent too long in one classroom.
5 Teachers were concerned about credibility from the point of view of specialist secondary inspectors looking at primary schools and also because few inspectors had had experience of working with the National Curriculum. Some specialist inspectors appeared not to appreciate the breadth of the primary school teachers' task.

6 The way in which reports were delivered was important. Teachers and headteachers appreciated it when criticisms were made in the context of appreciation of the school's good points. Discussion about findings was welcomed and there was appreciation of the opportunity to negotiate points in the written report. The length of time some reports took to be delivered was a matter for concern.

7 Headteachers and teachers felt that follow up was very important if the inspection was to be of value both from the authority and within the school.

8 There was no evidence to suggest that separating inspection and advice improved inspection and there was some evidence to the contrary. Follow up in particular was less satisfactory in Authority D than elsewhere.

Advice and support

1 There was concern about the changes in the advisory service. In most cases comments suggested that the service was offering less than previously. The exception to this was authority A where headteachers felt that they were getting more high quality attention.

2 There were frequent references to credibility. These concerned the 3 issues listed above under inspection. All these comments came from the primary sector. Advisers also showed concern about credibility but welcomed the opportunity to work in unfamiliar phases.

3 There were a number of comments about the need for advisory teams to move to a consultancy role. Headteachers felt that they were now in a different position vis-a-vis advisers and should be able to ask for the kind of advice they wanted.

4 Specific kinds of advice and help wanted included curriculum advice and advice on personnel. Headteachers wanted an adviser whom they could use as a sounding board.
for discussing ideas and plans. There was also a need for someone who could offer career advice to staff.

5 There were several comments from headteachers in authority A about the benefits of being in a small authority where you could know the advisory staff really well.

6 Advisers and advisory teachers showed concern about the best way to go about their work and how it could be evaluated and improved. They felt that they needed a broad perspective on education and not simply a view from one subject. They thought that it was important to make people think by being provocative to some extent. They valued being able to draw together people from different schools and different phases of education. In authority C there were advisory teachers appointed by the headteachers of a group of schools to provide especially for the needs of those schools and this appeared to work well. Advisory teachers stressed the importance of starting where the teachers were.

7 Overall it could be said that headteachers and teachers viewed advisers and advisory teachers more positively than negatively though many had mixed views. They were concerned about the pressures on the advisory service and the effect of these on work with schools.

Teacher development

1 The views of headteachers and teachers stressed the growing importance of the involvement of schools in identifying their own in-service needs. Comments reflected a system in a state of change from a situation where courses were mainly something provided centrally, free of charge to teachers, who decided whether or not to go to them, to one in which schools were more in charge of what was happening, provided a good deal of their own in-service training and had the money to decide what they wanted to buy by way of training for their staffs. Headteachers and teachers appeared to be happy with this change but concerned that the money was limited.

2 A number of the comments on the questionnaires and in the interviews suggested that teachers were looking for a lead from the advisory service and not always getting it. This was suggested by comments like, ‘They don’t present any new ideas’ and ‘Over emphasis on teachers helping themselves/each other on courses’.
The range of evaluation techniques for evaluating in-service provision was limited. All 4 authorities used questionnaires to evaluate at the end of courses and there was some evidence from comments that this affected what happened. There were other techniques used, such as observing what had happened in classrooms, but this did not seem to be widespread.

Educational philosophy and approaches
1 Headteachers rated the educational philosophy and approaches of advisers more highly than did teachers and more highly than they rated those of advisory teachers in all 4 authorities. Teachers rated the educational philosophy and approaches of advisory teachers more highly than those of advisers in 2 of the 4 authorities.

2 Advisory teachers were valued for way they worked in schools.

Knowledge, skill and experience
1 This study showed that the qualifications and level of previous experience of advisers and inspectors in the 4 authorities were above those found in the survey by Bolam in 1978. Eighty two per cent of advisers in these 4 authorities had first degrees compared with 42% in Bolam’s study. Forty eight per cent also had higher degrees which were not recorded in the Bolam study. Forty five per cent had been heads of schools in this study compared with 23% in Bolam’s study. The age range had remained much the same. If these authorities are representative of the national population of advisers, this could mean that there had been a general rise in qualifications and level of experience among advisers since the Bolam survey.

2 Chief advisers looked for the following in advisers and inspectors: intellectual ability, the ability to analyse, the ability to observe and pick up significant points quickly in schools, knowing what areas to focus on in schools, personality, basic humility and sympathy with other people, being able to influence people, potential, skill in reporting on inspections, understanding of school finances, having educational principles.

3 Headteachers and teachers looked for the following: sympathy, good communication, professional expertise, efficiency in delivery, skill in handling people, counselling skills, success and reputation in previous work, having clear ideas about education.
There was some concern about credibility recorded above but the question on credibility in the questionnaire had 7 good scores above 2.50 and no poor scores below 2.00 which suggests that the concern about credibility expressed in comments and statements in the chapters on inspection and advice and support is not as widespread as the number of comments would lead one to believe.

Relationships

The evidence from the interviews suggests that if advisers were unable to make good relationships they were limited in effectiveness. This ability will be even more important in the new pattern of working where schools will decide whether they want the services of the advisory staff. They will want people who will appear credible and make good relationships very quickly.

Culture and climate

1 People found support in being part of team. Small teams appeared to offer more support than large ones. This suggested that large teams needed to be a collection of small teams, each with a measure of autonomy and opportunity to make decisions about some area of their work, but working together.

2 There was a feeling on the part of advisers and advisory teachers than there should be a common culture of aims and purposes behind the work of an advisory team.

3 The development of a common culture and the opportunity to work together was helped when people worked in the same overall environment.

4 Chief advisers tended to see their role as providing vision and direction and an organisational framework.

5 The position of advisory teachers tended to be anomalous. They were not always seen as part of the overall advisory team. Some worked happily in small teams. Others were to some extent isolated. There were problems about their secondment and return to schools and at present their posts had an uncertain future. This made planning and organising difficult. Schools were not always clear about their role, but, as we have already seen, their work tended to be more highly valued by teachers, though not headteachers, than that of advisers.
Organisation and management

1 All 4 authorities had well-organised arrangements for planning.

2 There appeared to be a problem of communication in authorities C and D, in spite of a good deal of work on this by the managers of those teams. There also appeared to be a communication problem in authority B between advisers and headteachers. The problems, not surprisingly, appeared to increase with the size of the team and the split between advisers and inspectors in authority D did not help their communication.

3 The use of time was a problem for advisers because their planned programme was always being interrupted by emergencies and crises and additional tasks. This will require careful handling when services are on sale. It may be that some people should be left free to handle emergencies.

4 The 4 authorities used a variety of methods of evaluation. These included questionnaires following in-service courses and enquiries after an interval, user groups, a yearly review using computer records and culminating in a report on the work of the service, visits by the chief inspector to discuss inspectors' work with schools, observation in schools to see what had been implemented from in-service training, appraisal and setting criteria and assessing progress against them.

5 Some advisers and advisory teachers in particular still lacked adequate clerical support and this made them less effective.

6 The role of advisory teachers varied considerably even among these 4 authorities. In all 4 they were responsible to an individual adviser but in authority C some were also responsible to a group of headteachers.
18 THE WAY AHEAD

The changing pattern of work

The years since the Education Reform Act have seen a gradual change in the Governments’ view of the role which might be played by the local authority inspection and advisory service. The Act laid on local authorities the duty to see that the National Curriculum and religious education were taught. It also provided for the chief education officer or his/her representative to offer advice on the appointment of headteachers, a task normally undertaken by members of the advisory service. The role of the advisory service was interpreted by Sir David Hancock, then Permanent Secretary at the Department of Education in a speech to the Executive Committee of the National Association of Inspectors and Educational Advisers (1988, p.1) which included the following 2 paragraphs:

The local inspectorates will need to monitor and evaluate school performance. They will need to provide LEAs and the schools themselves with trusted and informed professional advice, based on first-hand observation of what schools are actually doing, of the way they are implementing the National Curriculum, and of the standards achieved.

There will be much innovative work to be done, affecting both what is taught and how it is taught... All this will call for the local management of change, for advice to schools as they think through the implications of the National Curriculum for what they teach and their schemes of work, and for support to schools and teachers to help them find their way through the uncertainties and anxieties which change so often brings in its wake.

At this stage the Department made additional money available for the appointment of further inspectors to enable local authorities to carry out this work and Circular 5/89 (p.7) included the following statement:

The local inspectorate or advisory service, together with the LEA’s advisory teachers, will have an essential role in preparing for, implementing and monitoring the National Curriculum and other developments arising from the Education Reform Act. Under the direction of chief education officers, local inspectors and advisers, and advisory teachers, should familiarise themselves fully with the new arrangements and be ready to offer assistance in translating statutory requirements into good classroom practice.

It was clear that at this stage the local advisory service was seen as a valuable asset in implementing the new legislation.

In 1989 two reports were published which had a considerable effect on the advisory services. These were the Audit Commission Report, Assuring Quality in Education and the report of the study by Stillman and Grant, The LEA Adviser, a changing role. Both studies were discussed in chapter 2 of this study and have been referred to in a number of other chapters. Both were critical of the organisation of the advisory services and the Audit
Commission was critical of the extent to which advisers spent time observing in classrooms. Subsequent studies by Dean (1990 and 1991b) showed that virtually all authorities had reorganised their teams in preparation for the new roles they were being asked to undertake. This involved a much greater emphasis on inspection and on classroom observation than had formerly been the case and in some authorities inspection was a new departure for the team. A great deal of work went into preparing for this and some schools in this study complained that they had less advice than formerly as a result.

The Audit Commission (1989, p.3) made a clear statement about the responsibility of local education authorities with regard to their schools:

A major responsibility of Local Education Authorities (LEAs) is the quality of education. The responsibility lies both at the LEA centre and in individual schools and colleges. At the centre, the part of the LEA's organisation primarily concerned with the quality of pupils' and students' education is the local inspection and advisory service. The importance of its role has been increased by the Education Reform Act and related government actions and statements.

Government views about the value of the local advisory service would seem to have changed gradually over the intervening years. It was suggested in chapter 2 (cf. p.34) that one factor in this change may have been the study in Leeds where additional money was made available for the improvement of primary schools. The local advisory service played a large part in this but when the evaluation was carried out it was found that there was not a great deal of progress in terms of children's learning. (Alexander et al, 1989). It would seem to be significant that shortly after this the main contributor to the evaluation, Robin Alexander, was asked to become one of the 'three wise men' invited to report on the way primary education should develop.(1992).

Lowe (1992) made the following comment about Government views of the advisory service:

It is perhaps too simplistic to conjecture that the advice and support aspect of the role actively facilitated the development of LEA policies and that a number of these policies were anathema to the current Government. In consequence it is one aspect of the advisory role which will be allowed to wither because it is politically expendable. It is just not a desirable role focus in a climate which is promulgating the need for a centralising of the development and implementation of policy.

Another contributor to the changes for the advisory service was the chief adviser for Wandsworth, John Burchill (1991), who submitted a paper to the Governments' Centre for Policy Studies suggesting a privatised inspection service. This was taken up and the 1992 Education Act and the the creation of the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) was the eventual result.

A recent report in the Times Educational Supplement quoted a minister as expressing
concern that the majority of inspection teams appointed by OFSTED (Office for Standards in Education) to undertake the first secondary inspections were from local authority teams rather than private teams.

These changes have been disturbing for advisers who are no longer secure in their posts, have considerably less freedom to operate than in the past and face very considerable changes. Lowe (1992, p.46) expressed this problem as follows;

This losing of control is a potent feeling for many advisers, particularly those who have been in the job for a number of years. The role has changed fundamentally, and a number of highly professional and competent staff feel their integrity being challenged in addition to experiencing the process of becoming deskilled.

If this is confusing for advisers, it is still more so for advisory teachers whose posts are even more vulnerable, as can been seen from the national survey described in chapter 5 which shows that twice as many advisory teachers are losing their posts as advisers.

The brief for OFSTED (1993, p.5) includes the following statement:

The purpose of OFSTED is to improve the standards of achievement and quality of education through regular independent inspection, public reporting and informed advice

The Education (schools) Act 1992a takes the major responsibility for inspection away from the LEA. The Statutory Instrument: The Education (School Inspection) Regulation (1992, p.17) contains the following passages:

Section 15 of the Schools Act replaces the unrestricted power of inspection given to LEAs under the 1944 Act with a strictly limited power to inspect when necessary to gather information to discharge the LEA’s statutory functions. The Secretary of State does not expect this power to be much used; in almost all cases LEA staff will as now enter schools with the consent of the governing body and staff. However, Section 15 offers a fallback power for use in cases of difficulty.

It goes on to describe the way in which money is to be taken from LEAs to pay for the privatised inspection scheme:

There will need to be an adjustment to the level of resources available to the LEAs following the introduction of the requirements of the School Act for the regular inspection of schools. The transfer of funds from local authorities will be phased over a period of 3 financial years to reflect the gradual introduction of the new arrangements, beginning with the secondary schools in September 1993 and other schools in September 1994. The Government’s view is that the resources which will remain with local authorities will allow them to give advice to schools where needed, particularly bearing in mind the greater weight of inspection evidence that will be available. Expenditure currently incurred on the employment of advisory teachers will also remain with the LEAs. The residual inspection responsibilities are not expected to give rise to significant expenditure.
This paragraph suggests that there is little understanding of the way in which advisory work is carried out and the need to know schools in order to be able to advise them adequately. Inspection reports are no substitute for first hand knowledge. LEAs will also be losing funding because of schools becoming grant maintained and this suggests that advisory services may dwindle still further. Clare Dean (1993) reporting in the Times Educational Supplement, notes that Cambridgeshire, one of the first authorities to devolve the money for its advisory services to schools, is laying off 60 members of its advisory service because their services have not been required by schools.

Schools must produce an action plan following inspection but nothing has been said said about the importance of support in pursuing the plan. Neither has anything been said about the role of the local education authority in assuring quality in its schools and the implication is that this will be assured by the 4 yearly inspection. Four years is a long time, however and there will be schools which need support and do not recognise their need. There will also be schools wanting support and unable to afford it.

The advisory service is therefore about to undergo what is probably the most major change since it came into being. Much time in most LEAs will be taken up with OFSTED inspections.

Circular 12/92 on School Teacher Appraisal (p.9) makes the following point about the appraisal of headteachers:

In the case of headteachers of county, voluntary controlled, voluntary aided, special agreement and maintained special schools, one of the two appraisers should normally be an officer or adviser of the LEA.

This too will be a time consuming activity, requiring time in the school getting to know the work of the headteacher. Circular 12/92 suggests that the appraiser should talk with staff, governors and parents as well as LEA officers and advisers as well as watching the headteacher at work.

The reduced force in many authorities will become a consultancy in the remainder of the time, catering for what schools see as their needs. In doing this local authority advisers will be competing with private consultants.

There are many problems about this. The reduction in numbers of advisers and advisory teachers and their involvement with inspection and appraisal at a time when schools need support with implementing the National Curriculum will mean that service will have to be very well organised and managed if it is to meet demands. It was clear from the national survey (chapter 5) that many authorities will no longer be able to provide advice across the whole curriculum because of the cuts in numbers.

Some of the headteachers in the study had strong views about buying in advice:
We feel the whole thing is almost immoral. ... There will be primary schools in our family who won't be able to afford the same level of advice and support and that means that that in turn will be badly needed. When you think that if children, if there isn't money to support ... that special literacy support of an on-going kind for a child, we will have problems a bit later and I think that shouldn't be based on money. And we also feel quite strongly that some of us have got friends, certainly close professional colleagues in most specialist areas and we are feeling that a conversation is unable to be had. You know, you can't meet somebody and talk about a problem without it now being a consultation. ... Certainly my head of curriculum support ... (who) worked with special needs support and now she finds that friends are unable to give her advice because really they should be charging her.'

*Secondary school headteacher, authority C*

Others had a much more positive view:

It's bringing back a sharpness and focus to what we're about that is important because people will effectively be buying back. Schools will be given a certain number of days a year and they'll want to make sure they're getting value for it. Sharpening up will be very important both from the school's point of view and the inspector's point of view. It's been a probably slightly cosy relationship to some extent, so far, in that those schools which made loud noises or those schools that were sympathetic probably received more visits than other schools.

*Secondary school headteacher authority D*

Garnett (1977, p.33) noted that the views held by headteachers about advisers were more positive than those held by teachers. It is interesting that the same finding is evident in the present study, undertaken some 16 years later.

She also found that teachers who had little contact with advisers thought their advice was likely to be 'irrelevant, impractical and even out-dated. It was felt that guidance was lacking and suggestions not followed up.' Teachers who had more contact with advisers saw the individual adviser as:

someone with a wealth of experience, whose visits were sufficiently frequent to make him (sic) conversant with teachers' situations and they with him, who offered practical help and new ideas, spent time talking with them, acted as coordinator of contributory schools and their secondary schools and became a friend and support to teachers.

This finding could have some bearing on the fact that in the present study teachers and headteachers in authorities A in particular and authority B to some extent, had more favourable views of advisers than those in authorities C and D. The staffing ratio of inspectors to schools in authority A was almost twice that of authorities C and D and that of authority B was marginally better. Teachers and headteachers in authority A would have seen their inspectors more frequently than teachers and headteachers in authorities C and D would have seen their advisers and inspectors. This suggests that as numbers of advisers decrease they will become less valued by schools and this could mean less business for them and further reductions in numbers.
It is also the case that what schools want may not be what they need. This was expressed by one adviser as follows:

I think I'm still wrestling with this whole idea of schools and effectiveness because what schools want from us is maybe not what they need. I mean wants and needs can be different things and you could be fulfilling the wants without actually getting anywhere near the needs.

Adviser, authority D

Wright (1991, p.486) expressed concern about a future in which schools would buy in advice:

Schools may buy what they want, if they can afford it; they may not recognise what they need. Many of the actual and potential problems of schools are of poor management and relationships. I doubt very much that the people involved recognise what they are doing wrong. In those circumstances, how likely are they to buy in appropriate help?

He also noted the problems that LEAs are likely to find in discharging their statutory functions without the advice and support function.

Maychell and Keys (1993, p.42) quote an LEA inspector on the LEA view of inspection:

We do not look at inspection as a kind of punitive thing that sets up a minimum high jump and anything that does not get above it has failed ... our prime interest is not in defining 'this is a good school' or 'this is a bad school'. It is being able to say 'is this school getting better?'

This is the function which LEA inspection is able to carry out because LEA inspectors know their schools. It is not a possible function for the new privatised inspection system which will not be in a position to make this kind of judgement.

If the advisory services genuinely have the ability to raise standards by their work it must be concluded that what has happened seems more likely to depress standards of education than to raise them. This was summed up as follows by Maychell and Keys (1993, p.66), who were writing about their study of the inspection role of advisory services:

One of the main issues emerging is the effect these changes will have on the provision of advice and support to schools. Many LEAs envisaged that if they developed the inspection side of their work this would seriously reduce the resources available for advisory work. The study found that most heads valued their LEA advisory teams, and were already concerned that advisers were over-stretched and unable to provide the service they were used to. Add to this the dramatic increase in delegated funds for advisory services, schools' fears that they may be unable to afford these services, and the proposed cuts in the number of advisory personnel, and the future of advice and support looks very uncertain indeed.
The four authorities

Each of the four authorities now has plans for the future which will change the way they work very considerably.

Authority A will lose 5 inspectors and 5 advisory teachers, leaving an inspectorate of 7 members and an advisory teacher force of 14. Two of the inspectorate posts have been vacant for a considerable time and they have had to rely on the existing inspectors to cover subjects not their own with help from advisory teachers.

Authority A plans to continue to provide a free service to schools including the general adviser role and in-service provision. The only service they will cease to undertake is advice on teacher appointments. All but one of the inspectors has undergone or will undergo training as Registered Inspectors and the idea is that this authority will form a consortium with 4 other London boroughs to provide inspection teams. They will also continue to do some inspection as an LEA.

Authority A (1991, p.9) had recently undertaken a survey of its advisory teacher force with a view to deciding the best way forward to meet the requirement to delegate 85% of the schools’ budget by 1993. This involved looking at the various alternative forms of organisation which might be possible and considering the strengths and weaknesses of each. In general it was felt that the present arrangements with the advisory teachers responsible to individual inspectors was preferable to any of the alternatives. The service was highly regarded by headteachers and teachers as was evident from the following quotation from the report which used interviews and questionnaires to ascertain the views of headteachers:

It is clear that the advisory teacher service is highly valued. During the interviews with headteachers and teachers, concern was expressed over the potential damage to the quality of educational provision in the Borough if the service were not available. The implementation of the National Curriculum in particular, is seen as requiring the support provided by advisory teachers, ‘We are at a stage’, wrote one respondent to the questionnaire, ‘when the role of the advisory service is more important than ever’.

The current model was seen as having established a highly valued reputation for the quality of its services. Support could be directed to priority targets and all teachers and schools could expect to benefit. The model strengthened the work of the inspectorate and provided a resource for following up local and national initiatives.

An alternative possibility would be for a portion of the advisory teacher budget to be delegated to schools, which could enter into service level agreements to purchase a proportion of advisory teachers’ time. This had the advantage that the service would be client centred and flexible and services could be sold to the private sector and commerce, but there would be risks for the advisory teachers in terms of job security and there might be difficulties in recruitment.
Another alternative would be to set up a business available to a wide range of clients and established as an LEA agency. This would have the same advantages and disadvantages as the previous suggestion and there would also be the need to find money for starting up the business. In additional there would competition from higher education and other educational bodies providing INSET and expertise would have to be built up in areas such as marketing.

The LEA might also act as an agent on behalf of schools, drawing on services available from higher education, schools and other consultancy sources which could be sold to schools. This would be relatively cheap to run and would make a wide range of expertise available. It would also make income available to schools who provided teachers as consultants.

The suggestions also included a range of variations on these themes. The results of this survey suggested some of the ways in which local authorities may be organising their advisory teams in the future.

Authority B will lose 3 advisers and 9 advisory teachers, leaving them with 18 advisers and 6 advisory teachers. Advisers leaving include the chief adviser who has left to start a private consultancy service. They plan to offer all services free except in-service education and they plan to discontinue the role of general adviser. A number of services will be available on sale to other than LEA schools. Eleven advisers have undergone or will undergo training as Registered Inspectors and 10 will train as team members. They plan to bid for all the inspections of the LEA schools.

Authority C will reduce its advisers from 50 to 21 and its advisory teachers from 20 to 6. With this much reduced service they plan to provide free to schools, advice on school management, monitoring and supporting the progress of the school development plan, involvement in the appraisal of headteachers, acting as link adviser, supporting the National Curriculum development, advice on learning and teaching strategies, advice on the designing and equipping of new schools, involvement with education otherwise (i.e. the education of those children whose parents choose to educate them at home) and home tuition and monitoring of health and safety. All other services will be on sale to schools and schools will also be able to buy in further service in the areas listed.

Nineteen advisers will undergo or have undergone training as Registered Inspectors and virtually everyone will be available as a team member.

Authority D will reduce its numbers from 27 to 20 or 21 advisers/inspectors and its advisory teacher force will reduce from 28 to between 15 and 20. The chief adviser has left to become a private consultant. They plan to sell most services offering only 7 services free. These are: monitoring action taken following an inspection, providing advice and support following an inspection, involvement in the appraisal of headteachers, support for schools in developing staff appraisal schemes, advice on the design and equipping of new schools,
involvement with education otherwise and home tuition and monitoring and advice on health and safety.

Authority D hopes that 8-10 inspectors will become registered and the rest will become team members including those who are now advisers.

**Inspection**

The future will see a situation where advice and inspection are clearly separated. This study included one authority which had separated these two activities and the results do not support this as being a better form of organisation. In particular follow up was weaker in the view of headteachers and teachers in this authority than elsewhere. This would be a fruitful area for further research except that the current plans make it an impossible task to undertake since in future there will be no authorities where the two activities are combined.

A number of points relevant to future inspections come from the current study. Undoubtedly teachers find the process of inspection threatening and this means that many teachers will not act naturally when the inspector is in the room. They found the experience less threatening when preparation was good and they knew what was being looked at. The OFSTED inspection schedule will be available to schools so this aspect will be taken care of in the future. The degree of preparation and its nature will be a matter for Registered Inspectors, who would do well to spend time on this so that what they see in school is somewhere near to the normal pattern.

Teachers also felt strongly about inspectors who did not consult before the lesson and give feedback afterward. They particularly disliked inspectors who sat at the back with a clipboard and wrote throughout the lesson without giving any feedback on this.

All 4 authorities in the study worked with the schools to plan the inspection, something which may not be possible under the OFSTED proposals.

There was a lot of concern about the credibility of inspectors. In particular headteachers and teachers were very critical of inspectors whose background was in secondary schools, inspecting in primary schools, although some felt that where such inspectors had done their homework, they might bring a fresh approach. It is to be hoped that this will be taken care of by the way in which OFSTED inspectors are selected.

Follow up to inspection will be very important and this is likely to involve local authority teams. The 1992 Education (Schools) Act makes the writing of an action plan following inspection the responsibility of the governors if the school has a delegated budget or the LEA if it has not. The implementation of this plan is likely to need outside support in many cases.

The study showed inspection correlated with knowledge, skill and experience at a 2-5% level and with relationships at the 1% level. These are not very surprising results and
confirm the points above about the need for inspectors to be credible to teachers in terms of their knowledge, skill and experience and the concern of teachers about the way inspectors actually behave in the school. The inspector who gave the impression ‘I am the inspector’ was very unpopular with teachers, who felt threatened and therefore felt that they were not behaving normally. They also felt that the children were conscious of this.

The new pattern of inspection offers many opportunities for study. In particular there is scope for looking at how effective this pattern is changing schools and at how schools actually deal with the follow up to inspection. The process of inspection itself may also be worth studying. It involves a more superficial study than many researchers would accept as evaluation and there has been very little study of the effectiveness of inspection as used by HMI.

Advice and support

Both Bolam *et al* and the Audit Commission recommended that authorities should consider the work they wanted their advisory services to do and staff them accordingly. There should be a rationale behind the staffing. Very few authorities have been in a position to do this and it now seems unlikely that it will happen since the market will dictate the level of staffing to a large extent.

It seems more likely that the advisory service will gradually move towards becoming a consultancy service, since most services will have to earn their salaries from payments by schools. In the case of a number of authorities schools are being sold a package of services (cf. chapter 5) This places the schools in a new and different role in which they decide what advice they would like.

Consultancy is different from advisory work in that the consultant does what the client wants rather than what the adviser thinks the client needs. It will take time to change to this role.

Murgatroyd and Reynolds (1984, pp.323,325) wrote of the use of consultants in school. This would seem to have considerable relevance for the way in which advisers might be working in the future. They suggested that consultancy might be one of 3 kinds:

- consultative assistance - the provision of assistance in solving a specific problem;
- content consultation - 'aims to bring about changes in the attitudes, understanding or skills of organisational members;
- process consultation - intended to lead to organisational changes.

In consultative assistance the consultant is regarded by members as having a high level of technical skill which he (sic) shares with members. This form of consultancy is generally a matter of working with a small group for a definite period of time.
In content consultation the consultant ‘shares the experiences and ideas with staff but does not direct them as the the choice of outcome they are seeking’.

Process consultation ‘is directly concerned with the quality and nature of the school or other educational organisation as a whole’.

They suggested that there were 6 stages of consultancy:
1. Initial contact between the school and the consultant, possibly with the school presenting some problem.
2. Establishment of a contract.
3. Consultant negotiates his/her position within the school to gain clear access.
4. Diagnosis.
5. Active intervention.
6. Consultant reduces level of his/her involvement.

Margerison (1978, p.32) wrote of advisory work in industry but much that he said was relevant to educational advisers, particularly in the consultant role which may be important for them in the future. He stressed the importance of helping people to think through the situation to their own solutions:

I encourage a client to talk, to express his (sic) views freely by providing a forum for discussion in which I spend most of the time listening or asking open-ended, non-evaluative questions.

I want the client in such a situation to come forward, to explore to consider the situation and put words to his concerns. He is unlikely to do this if he feels under pressure. It is vital to give the client the air space and time to develop his own thoughts.

He also stressed the value of discovering how people feel about a situation. He spoke of the adviser knowing where to channel conversation, when to listen and when to start to influence what was being discussed.

He also wrote of the importance of supporting clients while they were in the process of adopting new ideas. He felt that any move which indicated awareness or willingness to adopt new (and desirable) methods should be rewarded by interest and support.

Gray (1988, p.7,11) wrote about management consultancy. Today’s advisers are likely to become tomorrow’s consultants and many advisers and advisory teachers increasingly function in this capacity as schools become more independent. His description of consultancy might be seen as a description of good advisory work:

Consultancy ... is a helping relationship provided by people who have a particular range of skills for helping managers and others in organisations to understand more clearly what their business is about - that is become more relevant to the social and economic environment in which it functions from which it draws its resources and into which it has to return the product of its endeavours.
He went on to describe educational consultants:

(Educational consultants)... should understand how individuals actually behave in the educational system; should have appropriate interpersonal counselling skills; that they should be expert in the technical areas in which they are working.

Hancock (1990, p.8) suggested that a consultant might cover much the same work as an adviser or advisory teacher. A consultant:

- has a professional and educational oversight of the area involved;
- provides in-service training for the staff;
- negotiates in-service training for groups of teachers involved in the work;
- advises colleagues;
- provides advice to the headteacher, governors and the LEA on developments within the school.

He proposed that consultants might work in the following areas and any others of interest to the school:

- core curriculum areas;
- foundation curriculum areas;
- local curriculum areas;
- special needs;
- behaviour problems;
- primary/secondary transfer;
- staff development.

Nichol (1990, p.xxi) suggests that in the future the LEA will need to provide the following services for schools which are in a position to decide what sort of advice they want.

- An integrated service from a group of staff who either have direct expertise in the full range of advice and support required, or have access to it, and will pull the various elements together themselves to offer comprehensive advice to schools.
- A single point of contact with the advice team and preferably a single phone number for all advice.
- A service agreement that offers different levels of advice at different prices, with schools either buying a higher level of advice using money from their delegated budget, or choosing a lower level of advice and support and taking the difference to spend as they choose.

It has been evident throughout the study that teachers value the services of advisory teachers. In the table of average scores in the last chapter (cf. p.365) 45 scores out of 48 from teachers for advisory teachers were above those they gave to advisers for the same service. It is matter for great concern that the cuts in the advisory teacher service are so high (38%) since they are quite clearly valued by teachers for the help which they give.

Straker (1988, p.284,282) described a small study of the views of headteachers' and teachers' views of advisory teachers of mathematics who had worked in their schools. He
suggested that some of the success in the eyes of the headteachers and teachers concerned was due to the fact that the advisory teachers worked intensively with a small group of schools for a term at a time. ‘Some LEAs have spread the expertise offered by the advisory teachers much too widely to the point where the overall effect has been minimal.’ He also noted that:

Advisory teachers have enjoyed a credibility that exceeds that of the LEA mathematics adviser or higher education lecturer. The recent and relevant teaching experience of the ESG staff has been the main reason for this high credibility, as teachers have identified the advisory teachers as fellow professionals who, until recently, had been fulfilling a classroom function similar to their own.

He went on to note that the advisory teachers had helped mathematics advisers to function more effectively. He suggested that mathematics advisers had been increasingly under pressure with general duties and the development of work with computers and that the advisory teachers had provided much needed support for them.

Webb (1989, p.44,51) described work in which a team of advisory teachers set up consultancy with schools drawing up contracts to develop teacher initiated projects. They felt that this was more effective than the in-service training they had offered previously because teachers did not necessarily put the ideas offered in courses into practice. The work was evaluated with semi-structured interviews with the team, with teachers who had been involved and with the adviser who had been responsible for the work.

The teachers felt that the advisory teachers were most effective as change agents when they acted as role models, information providers, facilitators of cooperation, confidants and brokers in the exchange of ideas. The contract was seen as ‘a means of establishing a collective understanding about what change was to take place and how this was to be accomplished.’

Overall they concluded that consultancy was expensive in time because they could work with only a few schools in this way. It also involved finding out about the school:

They viewed the way of working as having increased their awareness of the range of values and the diversity of experience in all aspects of language existing even within one school. They saw it as important to understand the knowledge base and the ways of thinking of their clientele before trying to introduce new ideas into schools. They found the challenge of working closely with groups of teachers in order to find solutions to language problems and to devise policies enabled them to increase their subject expertise and their knowledge of the change process in schools.

Headteachers had views about what they wanted:

Many teachers feel that visits by advisers that are clearly outlined with positive target setting would be more beneficial than the rather ‘vague’ general visits made in the past. In the present climate of pressure through change, uncertainty of the future I feel as the headteacher there should be more positive support and encouragement for individual teachers from these visits. This will not be possible as staff will feel threatened if the advisory staff adopt the role of ‘inspectors’ as part of their duties.

Primary school headteacher, authority B
I think what I need at the moment and my staff, is time to sit back and look at what we are doing. And I don't think we'll be for perhaps 2 or 3 years wanting advice from outside when we begin to run out of ideas. I think we have so much coming at us in the last few years that we need time to digest it and get it sorted out.

*Primary school headteacher, authority C*

The study showed a number of schools wanting curriculum advice in particular, in relation to the National Curriculum. Headteachers also wanted an adviser they could use as a sounding board for ideas and there were some positive statements about the value of the general adviser as well as some negative ones. Views about advisers were both positive and negative with the positive views predominating. Headteachers valued help from advisers more than teachers, which suggests that perhaps advisers worked with headteachers more than with teachers, leaving the teachers to the advisory teachers.

Advice and support correlated with knowledge, skill and experience and with relationships at the 1% level and with climate at a level between 5 and 10%. There was no correlation with philosophy or with the organisation or the training of the advisory team. On the other hand there would seem to be some evidence that authority A, which tended to have better scores for views of advisers, also had better scores for organisation than other authorities and there was evidence in the documentation and in the comments of headteachers that the team was viewed as well organised. It would seem that the good organisation could be affecting the quality of work. Similarly in authority B, advisory teachers were better viewed than in the other authorities. The evidence from the chief adviser and the advisory team discussions was that their work was very tightly organised.

The organisation of advisory work offers some interesting areas for study as the pattern changes. In the immediate future there will still be teams operating in the traditional way and others operating as businesses. It would be interesting to see which has the greater effect upon schools.

**Teacher development**

Provision for teachers to develop their work is changing in many ways. The money for teacher development is now with the schools, who tend to look very carefully at what is offered in any course before spending money on it, especially as it often means spending money on supply teachers as well. There is also a strong move towards school based in-service work and it seems likely that in future there will be comparatively few central courses and a great deal of provision for individual staffs and groups of schools organised by the schools themselves with advisory help of various kinds bought in.
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The Cockcroft Report (1982, p.371) stressed the importance of school-based in-service support for teachers and made the following statement:

It is important that school-based activities do not become too inward looking. It is therefore helpful from time to time to invite someone from outside the school to join in meetings in order to offer new ideas and additional expertise. ... Unless this person knows the school well and is well-known to those who teach mathematics, a one off session may be of little value; it is usually more profitable to arrange a series of meetings so that mathematical understanding can develop and discussion be based on the perceived needs of the school.

The report went on to express support for the idea of advisory teachers who would be able to work with teachers in the classroom helping them to develop their work in mathematics. Following the publication of this report 350 advisory teachers were appointed from September 1985.

Advisers have already moved in the direction of working with whole staffs or groups of staffs from a small number of schools in school based activity:

There’s no doubt in my mind that where I’ve achieved anything in terms of raising standards it’s been due to the fact that I’m spending time with teachers and children. It’s been regular. I’ve found that has been necessary.

*Adviser, authority B*

I think there’s more effectiveness, potential for effectiveness, within a service contract in working with the whole staff in school based in-service than there is in collecting thirty different people from thirty schools and giving them the same lecture.

*Adviser, authority B*

I think we also have an educative aspect to our job which can also indicate our effectiveness and here I’m thinking about the teacher education that goes on through in-service training, changing classroom practice and then at the outside of the school, seeing governors sufficiently informed that they understand the issues and can support the heads in what they are doing in schools.

*Inspector, authority A*

I think drawing people together from different education establishments within phases and cross phases into a useful dialogue, that is an area which I think without us perhaps wouldn’t happen. Each school is inclined to become more insular and we act as a focus to enlarge the discussion, the activities between schools and that’s certainly something they badly need.

*Adviser, authority D*

A problem for advisers about centrally based in-service work has been that it has been extremely difficult to find time to follow up the work in the classroom. It may be that if schools are commissioning teacher development activities they will include an element of follow up, although it is difficult to see where the time will come from. The description by Webb above shows how effective this can be.

Teacher development has no significant correlation with the educational philosophy of advisers but there is a correlation significant at the 1% level with knowledge, skill and
experience and with climate. It is also correlated at a 5% level of significance with relationships. The changing climate for in-service work provides a particularly interesting area of study in looking at the effect of centrally based in-service courses as compared with school-based work. It would also be interesting to look at what schools do for themselves compared with what they gain from bringing in advisers or other outside consultants.

**Educational philosophy and approaches**

There appears to be no relationship between the philosophy of advisers and advisory teachers and any aspect of the key areas. This does not mean that this area is unimportant. It is clear from the questionnaire findings that headteachers and teachers are aware of the educational philosophy of the advisory team and it would be very difficult for advisers or advisory teachers to function without clear ideas of what they felt to be important. It is very difficult to make judgements about the educational practice of others without having a concept of what constitutes effective practice.

At the same time advisers have always had the dilemma that they needed to recognise that there is more than one way of teaching successfully. It is important that advisers and advisory teachers are aware of the educational philosophy of the teachers or schools they are trying to help and that the advice given takes this into account. This will be even more important in the future in that schools will be looking for consultants who speak their language and provide advice in their terms.

A useful area for study here would be the extent to which advisers succeed in accepting the philosophy of others and the way in which they relate this to their own philosophy.

**Knowledge, skill and experience**

The knowledge, skill and experience of advisers and advisory teachers is strongly correlated with all the key areas. One issue which clearly emerges from this study is the concern of primary headteachers and teachers with the credibility of those who advise them. In a situation where schools choose their advisers those who are not seen as credible will not be chosen. This poses something of a dilemma since primary schools badly need curriculum advice and most curriculum specialists come from secondary schools. We really need to develop a cadre of advisers who are curriculum specialists at the primary stage, who have a deep knowledge of their subject and good experience of teaching it at primary level. These people may gradually come from teachers who have been curriculum coordinators in primary schools. At the same time it will be important that such advisers are in touch with what is happening in the
secondary sector and able to advise primary schools about preparing children for secondary education. This would be a great deal easier if more advisers had experience as teachers across the phases.

There is scope for a study of the knowledge, skill and experience that advisers actually use in the course of their work and how this is best acquired.

**Relationships**

The ability to form good relationships quickly is an essential skill for advisers and advisory teachers. This is strongly correlated with all the key areas. It will be even more important in the future since schools will tend to select consultants with whom they feel an affinity. It will also be important for inspectors, since teachers will only teach normally in the presence of those with whom they feel they can relax. The skill of an inspector in making a teacher feel at ease is paramount and a good deal of thought needs to be given to this. There were a number of comments about this in the interviews in the schools that had been inspected.

Advisers in future will not only need to be able to make good relationships with headteachers and teachers but also with governors and parents who may have a very different frame of reference which will need to be taken into account.

An interesting area for further study here would be the actual behaviour of advisers and inspectors in relation to teachers and headteachers, particularly the kind of behaviour which is seen by the schools as creating good relationships.

**Climate and culture**

The climate and culture of the advisory team were related to the key areas of advice and support and teacher development but not to inspection. In view of the way in which inspection teams are to be formed in the future this may perhaps be unimportant. It seems likely that some teams will be formed for an individual inspection and change in some ways for the next and that the development of a real team climate and culture will not be possible. This may be partly taken care of by the schedule which determines what is to be looked at but there are likely to be difficulties in the differences of view of people who are not normally working closely together. However, this is a problem which HMI have always encountered and apparently overcome.

As small teams of consultants come into being they are likely to develop a strong team culture. There was also evidence from this study that most people in the advisory service see themselves as part of a team, very often of a small team rather than as part of a large one. It
is interesting that a national survey of the organisation of advisory teams (Dean 1990) showed that 49% of authorities had chosen to develop area teams, presumably in order to give people the chance to work together in small teams. There was also evidence in the present study that the leader of a team does much to create the team culture. Advisory teachers sometimes found themselves outside all the teams and sometimes were part of a small team. There would seem to be a need to consider more carefully where advisory teachers fit into the overall pattern.

It would be interesting to study further the value of small teams within the larger team. Team culture in inspection and advisory/consultancy teams would also merit further study, particularly in the context of the changing role of advisory services. It would be interesting to know whether inspection teams work together sufficiently to develop a team culture and if not, what the problems of working in this way really are.

Organisation and management

The organisation and management of the advisory team was not significantly related to any of the key areas. This was in contradiction to the findings that authority A which had the best results from the questionnaires overall, also appeared to have the most competent organisation and leadership and that authority B which had the best results for advisory teachers had this aspect of work very tightly organised.

The reduction in size of advisory teams and the delegation of money to schools to buy what they wish from the advisory staff suggests that a very tight organisation will be needed if the requirements of schools are to be met in a situation where there will be other important calls on advisers’ and advisory teachers’ time.

The study suggests that when the general adviser role works well it is very valuable to schools but that it takes time to build up the skills involved. Authority A apparently had developed the role so that headteachers valued it highly but authority C was at an early stage of development and only some headteachers felt that it was worthwhile. The national survey described in chapter 5 showed that 4 teams were planning to give up this role. If such a role does not exist it is difficult to see how the local education authority can know what is happening in its schools, particularly as numbers in the advisory service reduce. There is also the problem of the need for specialists.

The extent to which an LEA knows its schools in the future organisation would be an interesting area for study as would the role of the general adviser. It would also be profitable to study the organisations which LEA advisory teams are now developing and to look at their effectiveness in terms of what is happening in schools as a result of their work.
The training of advisers and advisory teachers

The training of advisers was not related to inspection and advice but was related to teacher development at a level of 10% which is not significant. However, it has already been explained that the questionnaires on training reflected the past rather than the present and all 4 teams had programmes of adviser and advisory teacher development in place.

If knowledge, skill and experience are important, advisory teams must see that their members have the knowledge and skill needed to do the job. Once again, schools will not employ people who have not the necessary knowledge and skill and it is therefore essential that training takes place at an early stage after appointment and that there is the opportunity for updating knowledge and skills for more experienced people. Training may be partly a matter of learning on the job by working with more experienced people but schools will not be prepared to pay for mistakes arising from inexperience. Stillman and Grant (1989) and the Audit Commission (1989) both make the point strongly that advisory work is not the same as running a school or department and that there are new skills to be learned and knowledge to be gained.

There is a great deal to be explored in identifying the the forms of training which are most effective for people undertaking this kind of work. Authorities have developed induction training and this could be evaluated in terms of how well it matched what those experiencing it felt were their needs. The training for inspectors provided by OFSTED needs to be evaluated both in terms of the effectiveness of the inspections themselves and in terms of what those experiencing it feel they have gained. In particular training in inter-personal skills would seem to be important bearing in mind the importance of creating good relationships. This is an area in which a number of ways of training are being developed and would gain from evaluation. Advisers in the future are also going to need training in terms of business skills and marketing. These are areas in which industry has a good deal to offer but also areas in which there could be useful evaluation of courses.

A number of people commented that training on the job had been particularly valuable and this too could be explored further. What kind of training on the job is effective and how is it best done and for what aspect of the work?

The effective advisory team

An effective advisory team has a shared culture and vision of what education might be about which arises from talking together and agreeing aims. At the same time its members are prepared to recognise that others may have a different frame of reference and that advice needs to be in terms that the recipients can accept.
The team is well staffed and well organised and led. There are clear and agreed objectives which affect the work of all members and which are known to headteachers and teachers. Members are each part of a small team within the larger team which gives everyone the chance to contribute to discussion and planning and there is good communication. Work is well managed so that advisers spend the optimum time in schools. There is a firm framework of what is expected and there is freedom to organise work within that framework. There is careful planning which allows time for crises and emergencies so that these do not always disrupt the planned work of individuals. There is stress on delivering what is promised. Each school is well known to someone and this gives headteachers and teachers confidence in the service. The team is backed by good clerical help and there is always someone available at the end of a telephone for any headteacher or teacher who wishes to make contact with an adviser or advisory teacher.

The work of the team is evaluated regularly. There is a computer programme which provides quantitative information about the work of the team and headteachers and teachers are regularly consulted about the quality of work of the service. There is concern to see whether the schools in which advisers and advisory teachers have worked actually do better when it comes to inspection. There is an effective appraisal scheme which is linked to a training programme which affects all members of the team.

Members of the effective team are well qualified and have been selected for their successful experience and have been trained so that they possess the knowledge and skills needed to do the job. They are therefore credible to headteachers and teachers. They are professional, listen actively, have a basic humility and sympathy with others so that they make good relationships easily and are able to make teachers feel at ease and ready to discuss their problems as well as their successes. They are good communicators and are able to work in the consultative as well as the advisory role. They help teachers and headteachers to feel confident in their work and to take it further. They are skilled observers able to see beyond what is immediately evident in the schools, sensing the ethos of a school, observing the behaviour and body language of teachers and pupils as well as being able to assess the work. They are able to help headteachers and teachers to tackle problems, not necessarily by offering ready made solutions, but by helping them to think problems through to a solution. They have counselling skills and are also ready to offer career advice to teachers. They are good organisers and are well organised personally.

The team is able to draw on specialists in all the areas of the National Curriculum and for more general areas such as multicultural education and personal, social and health education to offer advice to schools and to provide in-service education for teachers. They are also able to provide management advice and training for headteachers and other senior staff.
in schools. All members of the team have a broad understanding of issues in education and are not narrowly subject based in their view. They are therefore able to offer general advice to headteachers.

When they inspect a school they are careful to prepare teachers well, explaining what they propose to do and how they are going to do it. They talk with teachers about the content of their lessons before seeing them and discuss them afterwards. They look at pupils’ work carefully. There is care in reporting to stress the positive and to praise what is good as well as to report clearly what needs attention. The written report comes quickly after the inspection and there is an agreed programme which follows up the inspection.

Advisory teachers are regarded as an important part of the team and their appraisal, training and work is carefully planned so that as much of their time as possible is spent in schools working with teachers. Some are appointed to work in groups of schools. Their terms of appointment are carefully worked out so that they can feel some confidence in the future.

The effective team is be able to work with governors and with parents as part of the inspection process, seeking out their frames of reference and advising in the light of this knowledge. Its members are also able to help governors in making appointments and in making other decisions when this seems to be needed.

Sometimes advisers or advisory teachers will help a school or a group of teachers to grow by the help they give. Sometimes they can offer the experience or the encouragement which will enable teachers to move forward. Sometimes they will sow the seed from which new development grows and keep it alive by their interest.

Advisers and advisory teachers need to be enthusiasts, a source of inspiration to teachers, findings good things in unlikely places, stirring, stimulating and enlarging the experience of teachers and so helping them to grow and achieve their full potential which in turn enables the teachers to help the pupils to achieve their full potential.

The contribution of the study to the evaluation of advisory teams

This study set out to identify criteria by which the work of local authority teams might be judged. These criteria might also apply to independent teams working in schools. They are expressed in terms of tasks and qualities such as:

- Supports work in the National Curriculum
- Is prepared to listen

These can be re-worded as questions to use as outcome measures. Direct questions might be asked in relation to the two criteria quoted above such as:

- Has the advisory service provided you with support for work in the National Curriculum?
Have the advisers who have visited you been prepared to listen?
A more detailed and sensitive approach might be to ask:
- How far has the advisory service provided you with support for work in the National Curriculum?
- How well have the advisers who have visited you been prepared to listen?
This would require a similar questionnaire layout to those used in this study with a method of grading views. A team wishing to evaluate its service could take the list of criteria and select from it items which were considered to be most important and express them as outcomes.

**Leadership**

It was clear from the comments of headteachers and teachers that they expected leadership from their advisory service in the context of the many changes happening at present (cf p.144, 243) though some felt that the leadership they wanted was not always forthcoming (cf p.224).

Beare *et al* (1989, p 101) pointed out that ‘The source of influence or power (of leaders) may be their expertise, or their capacity to bring rewards or benefits, or their capacity to apply sanctions, or their personal qualities which make them liked and respected as people.’ Advisers rely heavily for their leadership function on their expertise and personal qualities and this was evident in this study in that knowledge, skill and experience and relationships were strongly related to effectiveness in the key functions of inspection, advice and support and teacher development. Advisers have a limited capacity to bring rewards or benefits by supporting teachers seeking promotion and it could be argued that their role as inspectors in the present climate gives them some kind of ability to apply sanctions or to initiate the process of having sanctions applied in that they are able to state that a school is failing.

This research found a number of examples of headteachers and teachers looking to advisers for leadership and help with change and commenting on the value of help they had received. Chapter 3 in particular gives many examples:

- One teacher described how an in-service course run by an adviser and contributed to by teachers changed her view of how to work in the classroom.
- An inspector described the setting up of a section bilingue which involved teaching geography in French.
- A teacher described early practical courses in technology and later work by the same team which helped teachers to interpret the statutory orders for design technology. The teacher felt that this work not only affected technology but had implications for work across the curriculum.

There are also examples of the desire for leadership and leadership of change in particular in most chapters. For example:

- Many teachers feel bewildered at the current rate of change and are looking for a strong lead.
  *Primary school teacher*
They (advisers) have made it their business to know the legislation better than we have and they’ve given us advice based on that knowledge.

*Primary school headteacher*

The effective adviser establishes the relationship with the school, with the head, with the teachers in it and on the basis of a good relationship, challenges everyone in the school professionally.

*Primary school headteacher*

Leadership and leadership of change in particular were major tasks for the local authority advisory service as it was at the time of this study. Whether the service continues to have these functions in the future must depend on what happens if the change is made to unitary authorities and the extent to which the right to buy advisory services has been delegated to schools. Where the right to buy advisory services is delegated to schools, advisers will be in the role of consultants, fulfilling the demands of their clients, the schools, rather than advisers leading and acting as change agents. Some leadership for change will come from inspection teams but these will not necessarily be followed with the kind of support which has been possible in the past and the findings in this study from authority D where advice and inspection have been separated, do not augur well for good follow up to inspection. It remains to be seen whether these changes will result in a more effective education system.

**The future**

The statement above of what constitutes an effective advisory team at the present time emerges from this study. The future is likely to see something rather different. Advisory teams as we know them may gradually disappear and be replaced by a number of private consultants each offering their wares to schools. In the meantime the existing teams will need to become business minded and sell their services if they are to maintain the range of skills they currently possess. It may be possible for a period to continue to offer schools a range of free services but if the Government’s wish to increase the number of grant maintained schools to include virtually all secondary schools and most primary schools actually comes to fruition it will probably be impossible to maintain these services with the small number of advisers which will remain.

In this context the effective advisory team will be the one which is skilled at marketing its services, competitive in its pricing but which still retains many of the characteristics described above. It will be working almost entirely in the consultative role and the skill of its members in communication, in making relationships, meeting the requirements of schools, helping schools to solve problems, delivering what is promised, will be of the utmost importance. There will be a built in evaluation in that teams which do not meet the requirements of schools will not be employed.
The situation will also differ in that the schools will be calling the tune. It will not be possible to ask an adviser to change what is planned in order to deal with an emergency. The ability of the team to deal with crises and emergencies will have to be built into the programme. It will be essential to have adequate clerical support so that the time of advisers and advisory teachers is not used on such tasks as filing and photocopying.

In this context it is difficult to see how an LEA can know its schools in the way that has been possible in the past. If a school is not inclined to buy in the general adviser role and it is not provided free then the only source of information will be the four yearly inspection and possible complaints from parents or expressions of concern from governors. LEAs may therefore need to maintain a vestigial free service in order to deal with such complaints.

However good the service it is possible that schools may not be able to afford to employ it. The experience in parts of Canada where such a service operates is that schools have started to use experts from other schools on a quid pro quo basis rather than using the more expensive services available as a consultancy.

The future of the advisory services is still a very uncertain one. What is evident is that many of the characteristics of the effective service described above as well as leadership will be needed whatever the organisation of the service and whether it is public or private. The changes which are taking place offer very considerable opportunities for research.
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Dear Colleague,

I would be very grateful for your help with a piece of research into effectiveness in advisory work. You will appreciate that the advisory service is currently going through many changes and at present very little is known about the most effective ways of working for people in advisory roles. The starting point for this study must be to try to define what is meant by 'effective' and I plan to do this by inviting a number of people who experience advisory work in different ways to give accounts of occasions when they feel advisers, inspectors or advisory teachers have been effective. I hope very much that you will be willing to help me with this task.

Yours sincerely,

Joan Dean
APPENDIX 1.1

EFFECTIVENESS IN ADVISORY WORK

QUESTIONNAIRE TO ADMINISTRATORS

Authority...........................................................................................................................................

Please describe briefly a particular occasion or series of occasions when you feel an adviser/inspector or advisory teacher made a really effective contribution to the work of the authority

For educational and financial reasons the L.E.A. is involved in a programme of 'amalgamations' at Primary level. This frequently means the closure of a school - an emotive topic and a taxing experience.

In one recent case advisory input was most effective. In the early stages of consultations with the Governing Body the Adviser's detailed knowledge of the geography and staffing of the school was most helpful. His knowledge of staffing issues was again useful when consultation with staff and Teaching Associations began. The final stage of consultation i.e. with parents was again facilitated considerably by obvious in-depth knowledge of the school.

Job title of the adviser/inspector or advisory teacher concerned

General Adviser (Primary Phase)

What factors do you think made this particular occasion or series of occasions effective?

This was a situation where two factors were crucial. First, the detailed background knowledge of the school situation by the Adviser. Secondly, the professional expertise of the Adviser in the presentation of the information and in the handling of individuals and groups in a sensitive situation.

The assistance rendered to senior administration in this assistance was invaluable. A good example of Advisory/Administrative approaches being complementary. The complexity of the proposal under consideration demanded detailed knowledge which an Advisory colleague could supply.

Please return to Mrs Joan Dean, Lakeside House, 70A Waterloo Road, Wokingham, RG11 2JL on or before October 31st. Thank you for completing this questionnaire.
APPENDIX 1.2

EFFECTIVENESS IN ADVISORY WORK

QUESTIONNAIRE TO TEACHERS

Authority......................................................................................................................................................

Please describe briefly a particular occasion or series of occasions when you feel an adviser/inspector or an advisory teacher made a really effective contribution to your work as a teacher

The early practical courses provided in Technology, and the later work done by the same team to help practising teachers interpret Statutory Orders for Design Technology.

The practical courses (c.1988) were graded-offering progression of skills for teachers and removing much of the mystique surrounding the new subject of Design Technology.

Courses post-N.C.-orders for D.T. were invaluable in enabling teachers to embrace the orders as an extension of good primary practice.

I feel the input by this team affected my teaching not only in Technology but across the curriculum.

Job title of the adviser/inspector or advisory teacher concerned

Science and Technology Advisory Team.

What factors do you think made this particular occasion effective?

Exceptionally high standard of delivery with obvious attention to detail in pre-course planning. Relevant and worthwhile tasks (both practical + theoretical) placed in a classroom context. Above all - deliverers who were enthusiastic and committed primary practitioners.

Please return to Mrs Joan Dean, Lakeside House, 70A Waterloo Road, Wokingham, RG11 2JL on or before October 31st. Thank you for completing this questionnaire.
### TITLE OF LOCAL ADVISORY SERVICE

#### Questionnaire to teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please tick the appropriate box in column A to show the value you place on the particular service listed. Please tick the appropriate box in column B to show your view of the service as you have received it to date. The advisory service may be taken to include inspectors, advisers and advisory teachers.</td>
<td>Column A</td>
<td>Column B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Evaluating the work of the school through inspection</td>
<td>High priority</td>
<td>Medium priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Monitoring standards of learning and teaching</td>
<td>Low priority</td>
<td>Good service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Observing teachers at work in the classroom</td>
<td>Average service</td>
<td>Poor service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Monitoring classroom work</td>
<td>Service not used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Identifying shortcomings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 Giving positive and negative feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7 Giving teachers opportunity for preliminary explanation pre-inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8 Discussing work with teachers before and after inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Providing advice and guidance on work seen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Making constructive comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Helping teachers to plan their work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4 Helping teachers to identify and set achievable targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5 Challenging situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6 Helping teachers to think through ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7 Recommending appropriate resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8 Advising on the use of resources for teaching and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9 Supporting work in developing the National Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10 Supporting teachers dealing with assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11 Advising on learning and teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12 Providing advice on how to deal with pupils with special needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9 Providing effective in-service courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10 Planning and organizing courses effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any further comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>No. of years in teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please return it to Mrs Joan Dean, Lakeside House, 70A Waterloo Road, Wokingham, RG11 2JL by OCTOBER 9TH 1992.

Signed: ____________________________
Date: ____________________________
# APPENDIX 2.1

## TITLE OF LOCAL ADVISORY SERVICE

**Questionnaire to headteachers 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Inspectors</th>
<th>Advisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

NB It is accepted that any advisory team contains people with a variety of skills and no team contains people who are competent in all the areas described below. In this questionnaire you are being asked to give a general overall impression of the way you perceive the majority of the team. Please tick the appropriate box.

### Members of the advisory service in this authority:

- **A1** Have an overall vision of education
- **A2** Have clear objectives which are widely known
- **A3** Respect the views of headteachers
- **A4** Have regard for the needs of schools
- **A5** Have concern for pupils' achievement
- **A6** Emphasize the centrality of pupils in the work of the school
- **B1** Have personal credibility
- **B2** Have good general knowledge of education
- **B3** Have specialist skills
- **B4** Have professional expertise
- **B5** Are enthusiastic
- **B6** Stimulate teachers trying to develop their work
- **C1** Are sensitive to school situations
- **C2** Are prepared to listen
- **C3** Treat headteachers as professional colleagues
- **C4** Are professional
- **C7** Are supportive to headteachers
- **C8** Give headteachers confidence
- **C9** Communicate effectively
- **C10** Are clear and concise in the suggestions they offer
- **F9** Provide effective in-service programmes
- **F10** Plan and organise competently

Any further comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>No. years in headship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>under 35</td>
<td>36-45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please return this questionnaire to Mrs Joan Dean, Lakeside House, 70A Waterloo Road, Wokingham, RG11 2JL by October 9th 1992

Signed: .............................................

Date: .............................................
# APPENDIX 2.2

## TITLE OF LOCAL ADVISORY SERVICE

### Questionnaire advisers 2

Please reply to this questionnaire in terms of your own experience in your present authority. If the situation has now changed with respect to advisers/inspectors joining the authority please note this under 'any further comments'. Please tick in the appropriate box for each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>satisfactory</th>
<th>Some training</th>
<th>Little or no training</th>
<th>Would like training</th>
<th>Not appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Induction programme - introduction to the LEA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Induction programme - introduction to advisory work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Work on interpersonal skills, e.g. discussion leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Selection interviewing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Work on different aspects of the inspection of schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Report writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Consideration of what is involved in supporting headteachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Consideration of what is involved in working with governors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Consideration of ways of supporting teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Training in management skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Training in the skills of running in-service education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Provision of opportunities for up-dating knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Training in personal organisation e.g. use of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Training to work in other phases in education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Are you involved in an advisory service appraisal scheme?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Have you actually been appraised?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Do you have the opportunity to attend courses of your choice outside the authority?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>How many such courses have you attended since the beginning of 1991?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any further comments

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please return it to Mrs Joan Dean, Lakeside House, 70A Waterloo Road, Wokingham, RG11 2JL by OCTOBER 9th 1992

Signed: ...........................................

Date: ............................................
### APPENDIX 2.3

#### TITLE OF LOCAL ADVISORY SERVICE

**Questionnaire advisory teachers 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of post</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This questionnaire is part of an evaluation of the work of the advisory and inspection service. The intention is to look at whether there is any association between a strong team culture and headteachers' and teachers' perceptions of the service and similarly at whether training is associated with head teachers' and teachers perceptions.

Please tick in the appropriate box for each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>I feel I am part of the advisory team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>I am involved in some team planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>I know our team objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4</td>
<td>I plan with team objectives in mind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5</td>
<td>I know the team priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6</td>
<td>I make decisions about my priorities in the light of team priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7</td>
<td>I meet regularly with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8</td>
<td>I discuss fundamental issues with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G9</td>
<td>I work with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G10</td>
<td>I know the skills of my colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G11</td>
<td>I support my colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G12</td>
<td>I find colleagues supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G13</td>
<td>We have a clear management organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G14</td>
<td>Our management organisation works well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G15</td>
<td>We spend time as a team on our professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G16</td>
<td>The team supports my own development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many years have you worked as an advisory teacher:

- [ ] male
- [ ] female

Teachers' cert or PGCE
- [ ] Degree or degree equivalent
- [ ] Advanced diploma
- [ ] Higher degree(s)

Please tick the qualifications you have:
- [ ] 35 or under
- [ ] 36 - 45
- [ ] 46 - 55
- [ ] 56 - 65

Please tick the age group you come into:
- [ ] 35 or under
- [ ] 36 - 45
- [ ] 46 - 55
- [ ] 56 - 65

Please give the post you were in immediately prior to coming into the advisory service:

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please return it to Mrs Joan Dean, 70A Waterloo Road, Wokingham, RG11 2JL by OCTOBER 9th, 1992.

Signed: ____________________________

Date: ____________________________
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APPENDIX 3.0

EDUCATION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION EXCHANGE
LEA INSPECTION AND ADVISORY SERVICES

LEA ...................................................

[Please tick the appropriate box]

Section 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICES PROVIDED IN SEPTEMBER 1992</th>
<th>PROPOSED SERVICE PROVISION FROM SEPTEMBER 1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provided free by LEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring action taken following an inspection</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing advice and support following an inspection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and help with staff development programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of in-service courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on provision for pupils with special needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on school management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and supporting the progress of the School Development Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in the appraisal of headteachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on headteacher appointments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting as link/general adviser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on problems in schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting National Curriculum development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on teaching and learning strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Section 1 continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICES PROVIDED IN SEPTEMBER 1992</th>
<th>PROPOSED SERVICE PROVISION FROM SEPTEMBER 1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provided free by LEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for schools in developing staff appraisal schemes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on the design and equipping of new and remodelled schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on teacher appointments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for individual teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement with Education Otherwise and home tuition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on resources for learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and advice on health and safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services [please specify]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 2**

| How many inspectors/advisers have undergone or hope to undergo training as Registered Inspectors under OFSTED? |                     |
| How many inspectors/advisers have undergone or hope to undergo training as team members under OFSTED? |                     |

How many of the above will continue to undertake some LEA advisory work, apart from advice given in the course of inspection, after training as

| Registered Inspectors? |                     |
| Team Inspectors? |                     |
**Section 2 continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many of the existing team hope to continue working solely as advisers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many advisers/inspectors were there in the team in September 1992?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many advisers/inspectors will there probably be in the team in September 1993?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many advisory teachers were there in the team in September 1992?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many advisory teachers will there probably be in the team in September 1993?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 3**

Will services be provided to FE/tertiary/sixth form colleges?  

If YES, please give details of services to be offered.
### Section 4

**Will the advisory team continue to provide advice to the LEA?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**If YES, will this be provided free?**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**OR under a commercial arrangement (Service Level Agreement)?**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**What are your LEA's plans in relation to inspection?**

**Please describe briefly the way in which your inspection/advisory service will be organised in the future.**

**Name**  

**Job Title**  

**Telephone number**

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please return it to EMIE, The National Foundation for Educational Research, The Mere, Upton Park, Slough, Berkshire, SL1 2DQ, by
13/12/91

Dear Chief Adviser,

I am wondering if I can interest you in a proposal to evaluate the work of your advisory team. I am currently undertaking some research into effectiveness in advisory work as part of a Ph D. This an area in which no research has been done but it seems to me to be an area in which some knowledge of what seems to be effective could be very valuable at the present time when advisory teams wish to sell services to schools.

If you were interested, my plan would be to spend about three days with you, during which I would hope to interview you, sample groups of your inspectors, advisory teachers and primary and secondary headteachers. I would also wish to send questionnaires to a sample of schools (probably about 20%) which would involve the questionnaires being completed by headteachers and probably two or three teachers. I would then expect to analyse all the information I had collected and give you a written report, which, if you wished, I could come and speak to. The report would be confidential to your authority. I would be particularly interested in doing this in -shire because of the way in which you have reorganised your team.

I would hope to undertake the study during next term or early in the summer term and would aim to give you the written report before the end of the school year. Any account of the work done with you which I write up for my thesis or for publication would not identify the authority and I would regard the whole exercise as confidential.

If you would be interested I can give you a more detailed account of what I would plan to do with copies of possible questionnaires for you to comment on. I do hope this is a possibility.

With all good wishes for Christmas and the New Year,
Yours sincerely
PROPOSALS FOR EVALUATION OF AN ADVISORY TEAM

I would like the opportunity to evaluate the work of a number of LEA advisory teams as part of research for a PhD on effectiveness in advisory work. From the authorities’ point of view this will be little different from the evaluation I would undertake as a consultant, the only difference being that as a consultant I would be negotiating a framework according to what the authority wished to pay and as a researcher I am offering a framework which will need to be common across the authorities in which I am working. Each study will result in a report to the LEA concerned which will be similar to the report I would have produced as a consultant. The authority would not be named in my thesis or any subsequent publication.

My research is concerned with effectiveness in advisory work and I am looking at a number of aspects of the advisory service to see if any of them is associated with effective practice. They are as follows:

The organisation of the service
The overall team climate
The extent of training
The extent of planning and evaluation
The background of members of the team
The size of the authority
Whether advisory services are being sold to schools

1 Before visiting the authorities, I should like to have the following information if it is easily available. I am not asking for it to be specially prepared.

a) A list of inspectors and advisory teachers
b) A statement about the organisation of the advisory team
c) A statement of the aims, objectives and priorities of the advisory team
d) A statement about their current approach to advisory work i.e. how far has the LEA got with the idea of selling services, how are they dealing with inspection etc.
e) A list of schools

2 The work I have already done has enabled me to arrive at a series of criteria about effectiveness. I have used these criteria, together with information from chief advisers, from LEA documentation and from literature to develop questionnaires for inspectors, advisory teachers, headteachers and teachers. I enclose a sample copy of the questionnaire for headteachers so that you can see the kind of information I am requesting. Your
questionnaires could be modified slightly to conform with local nomenclature or other arrangements.

I would hope to discuss the final form of the questionnaires and the date for their return with you during my visit to the authority so that they can be sent out subsequently. The headteachers' and teachers' questionnaires would be sent to 100 schools which I will select on a random basis when I have received your list of schools. The questionnaires to advisers and advisory teachers will go to everyone in those services.

3 I plan to spend three days in each authority, interviewing individuals and groups of people as follows:

a) The chief adviser.

b) A group of about five advisers which includes the following if possible:
   - a person in a senior post
   - someone who has joined the team recently
   - a person of substantial experience in the team
   - two other people
   I appreciate that this depends a good deal on who can be available

c) A group of about five advisory teachers. I would like the group to include if possible people with the following responsibilities:
   - information technology
   - primary education
   - some aspect of secondary education
   - TVEI
   - some aspect of special education

   These areas are simply suggestions, chosen mainly because they are likely to be present in all authorities. They are also likely to give a spread of experience and interests.

d) A group of five primary head teachers and a separate group of secondary headteachers. I would suggest that in each case the group should include heads from a variety of kinds of school, including primary, junior, infant, nursery and special in the primary group. I should also like the group to involve:
   - a head who has been a considerable time in his/her present post
   - a head who has spent most of his/her time in the authority, in a variety of posts
   - a head who is new in post and new to the authority
   - a head of a very small school
   - a head of a large school

   Each meeting will take about an hour.
4 I should like to visit four schools, including both primary and a secondary, which have been inspected recently. I should aim in each case to interview the head and if possible, a small group of staff. I should interview about the inspection and also about the advisory team.

5 I would like to end the three days with a brief discussion with the chief adviser giving immediate feedback on my findings from the various discussions.

I would hope to provide a report for the authority by Christmas or soon after depending on the date by which the questionnaires are returned and the speed with which I manage to analyse them.

Joan Dean
APPENDIX 5.0

ADVISORY AND INSPECTION SERVICE
AUTHORITY C

Discussion with advisers
June 30th 1992

JD I’d like to start really by asking you your views about the way in which your team is now organised and the work is now organised. You know, how happy you are with that particular organisation?

Bi Can I ask if we’re talking about the whole advisory team or the different teams in which we function within that organisation?

JD Either. Whichever you prefer.

Bi I would say that if you talk about an area team, that they were in many ways arbitrary divisions which supported ... and discussion. And since we have worked together more on link review and particularly team review, I think there’s been a change in terms of knowledge of each other’s values, methods of working and in my case, universally, a greater esteem.

JD Is that tied up with the area team or - ?

Bi That’s right

JD Yes. What do other people feel about the area team?

J I think I’m going identify myself straightaway that I think that there’s also the issue the division between curriculum and general advisers and that has tended, certainly in my work, to sometimes marginalise the curriculum advisers and impacts on the work of the general adviser. And the other issue of the curriculum adviser’s work across county. They’re not restricted to a particular team. So that is a tension - a different dimension of working. And I think what has certainly happened is that sometimes the curriculum advisers have felt marginalised because they’ve not been involved in actually what has been discussed and usually all the general points.

JD Yes. Other people? ( to G) How does it strike you coming in?

G As a newcomer I found the structures very helpful and initially being a member of a smaller team within one of the areas was particularly useful in terms of the initial induction process, and having a network of people that I could quickly associate with and actually allow myself to get functional. I found also that the sort of procedures
within the area team were quite clear, were quite clearly laid out for a newcomer. It was very apparent who your line manager was and what were the procedures you went through in the majority of cases to actually get things done. The confusion obviously is where the area team mesh and actually finding your way through that. For instance, entering a link review for the first time I wasn’t aware that it was inappropriate to ask curriculum advisers in other areas to enter into a link review when they may have a special thing to offer with that particular focus. You know I found that a bit weird but I can see the logic to it as well in terms of trying to get the area teams working as a cohesive group. It’s a bit of a curate’s egg, really, but overall, my overall impression was one that it was a useful structure and that’s purely from a personal point of view. I feel less qualified to comment in terms of the schools because obviously I’m really just beginning to get into that scenario with them.

A I feel very strongly about area teams. I think it’s one of my main forms of support, the other one being the bay in which I happen to sit at County Hall. It’s a group of people whom I feel I know fairly well and hopefully know me fairly well and it’s a very strong support structure. We’ve gone through some steamy times over the last few years with agreements, disagreements, lots of angst, lots of anxiety, lots of angry meetings and I think we’ve come out stronger as a result of it. I know there’s been some points where I’ve not gone to meet them because I can’t stand the angst that’s been floating round but I think we’ve come out of it very strong too at the end of it.

JD Val?

V I think particularly as I’m on the verge of leaving area 1 and moving me to another area, I didn’t realise that when you actually get to the point when you actually have to leave and move into another group - now that’s actually causing me some concern. Now that’s interesting because it’s actually concern and commitment to the area team. And I think all the difficulty that I’ve found in terms of managing an area team is not being clear about the which are area team’s responsibilities and which issues are actually made at area and county or even in departments. And sometimes it’s a difficulty of not being sure what we can do and what we can’t do and the team has made a decision and come up against somebody else’s view and that’s quite hard because once a team has made the decision that’s what they want to do. I think that’s actually been the difficulty. And I think also the whole concept of a line manager because when I joined the service, only five years ago, there certainly wasn’t a line manager and one could decide to be a bit of a maverick really and so we’ve had to absorb that, you know, not working to your own agenda but working to someone else’s agenda.

JD That actually brings me into the next question about how far you’re free to make your own programme and how far you have an agenda which is laid down for you. Come on Bernard, you’re looking as if you’ve got something to say on that.

Be No. As usual I was actually hung over with the question before. What I would like to say is that even if it is the crime of old-think, the linguists have continued to work
together and regard ourselves as a team where it’s appropriate that we should do things
together - um - so that we’ve got two heads of department conferences a year where
eighty heads of department come - at the moment, at the moment - and we all three of
us, four of us, work to plan and to run those. So that what Julie was saying about the
division here between curriculum advisers and general advisers works in part. That’s
certainly the intention. Otherwise you wouldn’t have a different line manager for the
curriculum adviser than for the general advisers. I wanted to say that.

V Julie pointed out that curriculum advisers actually work across the LEA for 30% of their
time but all of them work across the LEA.

J But I don’t think it necessarily works out like that all the time. I mean, people spend very
little time, I think working outside these areas and working on the curriculum, because
of the pressures. I think the other thing I’d like to say about the particular area team that
I’m in. There was a lot of - we didn’t have rows, but there was a lot of, ‘I don’t want to
be part of it’ in the team and some people just not coming at all. We didn’t have, I don’t
think, the same cohesion at the beginning and that’s gradually changed but there was
quite a lot of negative feeling, some people sitting there thinking, or even saying ‘I don’t
want to be here. I’d rather be doing something else.’

Bi I think to be fair, it’s got to be acknowledged that within the structures as they were set
up a number of changes have had to be accommodated. In fact the whole move towards
extended review, the whole move towards forging a more generalist role for a large
number of people, you know, are new dimensions which have had to be taken on board.
The one question that I’ve got in relation to the team structure - and it was a question
that I had in the other authority that I worked in - was just how consistent we are within
the teams that are operating at the moment and therefore the networking between the
team structure needs to be perhaps formalised and looked at and examined in terms of
making that - providing a more consistent approach and a more consistent service. I
don’t think we’ve actually, I don’t think many LEAs have actually cracked that one.

JD No, no.

J Could I come back again - the curriculum/general adviser? I do pick up from curriculum
advisers perhaps they find the team less important and what’s more important is their
specialist area team or good people they work with and so that’s quite difficult.

JD Yes. I can see that. Can you move on to my second question about the extent to which
your work is laid down for you and the extent to which you are free to plan it?

V I just feel that somebody else is pulling my strings which is mainly I guess the position
I am in. You just get called on to do all sorts of mainly things in the office. I do get part
control. I put things in my diary but often I do get, you know, asked to write a paper or
do something and you just have to respond. I’m not as much in control as I was five years
ago.
A I almost feel we’ve got the worst of both worlds, that we - nobody dictates what they
do to our diaries but we do castigated too about whether or not things are in our diaries
and in some ways it would be easier - I would hate it - but in some ways it would be easier
if somebody said, ‘This is what you’re going to do and this is when you’re going to do
it.’ That would then at least tell me what commitments I’d got that I couldn’t move and
I could plan accordingly for the rest of the time but when there appears to be no link
between what we have to do and the amount of time we have in which to do it and then
you’re told well, it’s up to you to plan it, it becomes - I think that’s one of the greatest
causes of stress.

JD Do other people feel that?

Be Yes, I mean very clearly we’re moving in the direction of having more directed direct
time and indeed, there’s been tension about that kind of decision made. For example,
it’s quite clear if there’s a theme review and you’re on it for a fortnight, say, you need
to know when it is and what your commitment to it is, ditto team review and as you come
down the scale you get more and more freedom about when you decide to try to fit in
those things which you need to do, that is to say link reviews, general reviews and other
work.

JD Julie?

J I think probably again, curriculum advisers are a bit freer, partly because we don’t have
the pattern that we have to fulfil with schools, we’re not attached to schools like the other
advisers are, so I feel that at the moment I have a reasonable amount of flexibility. The
only thing to get involved in central tasks but in the sense of curriculum work there is
a degree of flexibility there and a pattern of support. But I think this is gradually going
to change. We’re certainly being used more in reviews as well so that will change. But
also, I suspect, the commitment to the amount of time we spend in schools and working
in schools, that will have to be set down more, particularly where you are talking about
selling services to schools. You have to have some form of guarantee that you are
actually mean to spend the time there. I think that’s one of the attractions of the
curriculum adviser’s work that people pine for. It’s the flexibility.

JD Yes, yes. Have you anything to add to that Garth?

G I’m in a probably slightly false position. I have been given the opportunity to really sort
of get in and work with a group of schools that for various reasons haven’t had a general
adviser on a regular basis so my part has been to get down to work extensively with the
schools. Having said, I mean, that there have been a number of tasks that have been
passed down the pipeline because it’s been recognised that I haven’t as yet got a
specialism and the timing of those and the method of informing you about those - how
can I put it? - could have been better I think in terms of helping you maintain and sustain
what you’d already planned to do. I mean the other positive side of that as well as you
get more involved in school, I’m finding the demands from schools are becoming far more varied too. It’s not only within the structures that we work in County hall, but in terms the schools themselves not making demands but making requests on a whole range of things that wouldn’t necessarily fit into the tighter descriptions of extended review work and providing for that is an extra tension. But I’ve felt on the whole that this first term that life begins to be in balance in terms of having directed time and delivering ... 

JD How do you all feel about the review processes that you’re doing? Do you feel that they’re going well? Do you feel that you’re doing it the best way possible? Are you critical about them? You know, what are your views about them?

A Before extended review came in, I mean before April ‘91 when we all actually had a change of role and a change of groups of schools. I had 61 primary schools and I found it refreshing to be able actually to go into an establishment on a regular basis and I feel I’m doing something now, whereas with 61 schools I really didn’t feel I was doing anything. I was visiting if they were lucky or unlucky, whichever way you look at it, twice a year, a royal visit at the time and being shown what building work had been done and in some schools you got involved in some issues but I found that very frustrating. I didn’t get to grips with anything. I find just having a smaller number of schools very helpful although the workload has increased because of the expectation of how much time you give.

I’ve, I went into link review I suppose in the same way as everybody else with a great deal of trepidation and not knowing what on earth I was doing and I’ve enjoyed it. I never look forward to them and then I suddenly surprise myself at the end of the day that it’s been a quite fascinating day and I’ve learnt a lot. I’ve learnt a lot about myself and about the colleagues I’ve worked with. I’ve learnt a lot about the school. I’ve learnt a lot more in a day on a link review about a school than I could ever learn by three or four visits. It’s not enough. It gives you a focus, a very clear focus. And I didn’t understand the system. I was sceptical about but I didn’t understand it and I did actually eventually support it.

JD Right.

G I would agree with all that, word for word. I’m totally, totally impressed by it, having been through it before with a similar sort of package in a different local education authority, I find the process of looking with, rather than looking at, is much more productive. The focus itself is often valuable in providing a whole range of useful information and perspectives for the school but also the process that you go through I think is enormously helpful to the schools because it leaves them with something they can adopt and adapt for their own purposes. But it’s linking that sharper edge through the LEA contact with the school’s own review process. It’s certainly a recipe if we can hold onto we ought to, because it’s a service that certainly seems to be valued by the majority of schools and I certainly share Aileen’s point that if you know, it puts us on a steep learning curve because you’re constantly coming across a whole range of things that you need to get to grips with. Very useful.
JD Are you involved in this Julie or not?

J Yes. I am in terms of link review. I'm involved in the - have been in the subject specialism areas and asked to do that within the area and actually to do this in other areas. I've found that very useful because you're looking at the application of a subject area in the classroom and could actually get hold of and look at children's learning. The theme review I found very useful because that was broadening out and I haven't done a team review yet but I understand I'm going to do. Again can I say that curriculum advisers are not as deeply involved in review. I mean I have great - um - reservations about this continued division between curriculum and general advisers. I think there'll have to be a revision of it, because it's silly, really and it's leading to all sorts of tensions that need to be sorted out.

JD What would be better?

J Well, - um - I suppose you've got to look at what's realistic and I don't think it's realistic to have curriculum advisers cutting in on the areas. We're gradually dropping out of the team, dropping off. We disappear and we're not replaced. Different areas of the curriculum disappear in terms of support so you're not actually providing across the board curriculum support anyway. So I guess most authorities have gone down the line of the general adviser with a specialism attached to them and I can't see that there's any other way round that. But I think that does create lots of problems in terms of the adequacy of support that can be give. They're two separate responsibilities and when you're talking about selling the services you've got a real tension there.

A Can I just say in terms of what you said about curriculum advisers and review? I think one thing - because obviously I've worked with a number of curriculum advisers in link review and the one thing you have as curriculum advisers is much more ... experience of review. I have done my own link reviews. I know how I work. I've done one of the link reviews as a general adviser but as curriculum advisers you are probably in the better position to judge what is the best system and how it's working and what form of report has worked well and you've actually got information that I feel as the general adviser - I mean I feel I'm blinkered -

J Yes I'd certainly agree with that. I think as curriculum advisers do more ... skills. I think it's been quite a slow process getting curriculum advisers involved in that, but as they do more they will begin to be able to balance up the way it is working and I think also we were given a choice of whether we wanted to be involved in link review. Actually I think that's quite problematic because of diaries and fitting things in and not having days. It's not very systematic and looking at the figures for days the other day, in terms of expense of time we should in fact do something like eight link reviews a year. I don't think anybody does this.

Bi Interesting. I had no idea - which goes to show something about the way the service actually works or doesn't work. I had no idea - interesting.
Tell me, if I could just turn for a minute to the general advisory role, how clear are people what is involved in being a general adviser?

I'm clear it's everything and nothing.

What do you mean by that?

Well it can be all embracing or it can just be keeping in touch with the school.

Yes?

I mean, I feel that - in a sense it's not clear that there are a set number of tasks. I don't know that I would - perhaps I would want to do the tasks that were priorities but the important bit is being able to respond to the school and what the school needs - are priorities possible? Sometimes that's actually been support to the head or individual members of staff, sometimes that's doing a lot of work in the classroom. I mean it can be anything. It can be involved - I'm certainly involved in headship appointments, which is probably the key one, possibly involvement in deputy headship interviews but it's - I think it's very difficult to tie it down. If I listed the things that I have done with schools they would all be very individual and they would all be what the school feels it needs and I suppose what I feel it needs as well.

There have been attempts to measure this kind of thing by questionnaire or just asking people or whatever, but that reflects, that wish to measure, reflects a tension which there's been in the rhetoric and the reality both about what review is and had one colleague, Richard, had he not produced a paper on what extended, what general review might well be I think there might still be a huge vagueness about what the general work of the adviser is. And it was quite clear from some of the responses that people regarded some things as review which it was very difficult to make come in terms of the definition. One more thing which I would like to say is that, inevitably, we're being - the tide is in the direction of review, of monitoring and evaluation as the prepondering part of the work. You can count that in so many days and so many schools. And the other kind of support which sometimes is desperately needed - I had a phone call at quarter to ten last night from a deputy head extremely worried about the school and wanted to talk about it. And now I'm going to see her next week and that'll take an afternoon of time. The school won't pay for that. You could call this attention part of the work of general review.

Val?

It's quite difficult to comment about that because I was actually moved out of the general adviser role just at the time when it was beginning to develop and I'd just got one school going and I was ready to come back to the role in September and several of my difficulties were just having that one school because I think in talking with colleagues they've got a range of experience - um - and they've got a feel for a whole
range of activities that Aileen and Bernard I think are referring to. With only one school
my experience is quite limited and I think part of that is because the school isn’t clear
about what my role could be.

JD I mean certainly that seems to come over in talking with the heads that not everybody
is clear what the role is. - um - And it sounds as if not all the advisers are clear what the
role is but I could be wrong on that. Have you any observations on that Bill?

Bi Well, one or two. I mean it’s back to this consistency more than anything really. Having
a - building up a contribution from everyone. It’s very difficult to do that when you’re
largely working on your own as a general adviser and if you’re not careful, largely being
reactive to school things. I mean, you need also to have some vision of where you’re
going with the group and to be a bit more creative, a bit more proactive. I don’t think,
as well, something that I’ve been trying to look at is - we’re not necessarily that good
at evaluating. You know, we come away with impressions and we hope we’re doing a
reasonable job but are we really and what does that look like across the service. The
whole work of evaluation is something that we need to - as a layer of profession to get
into.

JD Has anybody - that was something I was going to ask you about a bit later. Has anybody
else got any comments on evaluating what you do?

A It doesn’t happen. The first stage which would be interesting to have is some feedback.
We don’t even get feedback. We could have some schools offering the department some
feedback on what we’re doing, how well I’m doing and whether I’m doing it right..
Actually I’m beginning to sound like schools who want the review process to tell them
whether or not they’re doing it right. I’m falling into that trap. I think - yes - I don’t know
how you’d do it because I think it is so complex but you could evaluate parts of the role.
I don’t know how you’d evaluate the whole role because it is such a complex role. I can
think of some situations that I’m involved with with some schools where the schools
don’t actually know I’m involved in that way. You know it might concern a deputy head
wanting to talk about the school which the head of the school really doesn’t know
anything about, so there is a bit of cloak and dagger work in it as well. I think that would
- I suppose you’d have to evaluate different bits of the role rather than the role as a whole.

V I’ve done a bit of work on evaluating review, team review, but that was only really one
aspect. It was really trying to identify what people valued, adviser, heads and inspectors,
and what could be improved. It was like an interim evaluation to get things feeding back
into the system, but we haven’t done anything in depth. Although I suppose, I mean
don’t like to mention it, but in fact the appraisal could have potential - we actually do
want feedback on particular effective work. We could use that profile, to seek that
feedback on the area that you want to look at. You can’t look at everything, couldn’t
evaluate everything but if there’s something that you particularly want to know about,
it could be used in that way.
JD  Yea.

J  I certainly evaluate impact. That’s very easy, actually to evaluate. I wonder how easy it is to evaluate your effectiveness working across 500 schools. I just don’t know how you’d go about doing that. I suspect what I do most of the time is get an impression from supporting schools. I don’t see how you’d do that.

A  We tried - the teachers - I work with the advisory teachers. We try and look at the most effective - possibly the most effective ways we can work, given the constraints that we’re working under. Because I think sometimes you’re actually being asked to do something in a context which is almost impossible to do it in, with the constraints we’ve got at the moment. And that becomes frustrating. But I think it is very difficult. I get feedback from all the teachers that I’m involved with, when I do management in schools.

JD  Yes.

Be  You raise a lot of interesting questions and there won’t be time to debate them this morning. Just as Bill’s question of consistency, there are a lot of issues which we’re not touching on. This evaluation thing - yes, one gets evaluation sheets back and one talks to teachers and there’s a question beyond that, what difference it makes to what happens at the sharp end. We have to ask that. With the appraisal - if one can make a remark about that - um - there has been no service agreement about what constitutes evidence, so that the appraisal actually is an impression.

A  I actually get the impression that we don’t get any feedback as to whether the department are happy. Yet it is a bit of the department as a whole. But my impression of those who are line managers actually have no time to manage. So I do not know how my line manager would know how well I was doing because he actually has no time in which to manage me. He only has time to talk to me and I find that valuable, but in the sense of knowing what I’m doing and seeking the views of other people, he does not have that time to do that.

V  That brings one back to consistency, doesn’t it, because there were some things there - I simply wanted feedback from the head whom I happened to be working with to see how I could do things differently, get more output, perhaps work a bit better for the sake of the school. So consistency issues, you know, we all do the bits and managers might do what they think are best but we don’t certainly talk to each other about sharing ideas and therefore developing some agreement that we all do it this way and have a consistent approach.

J  - said about the sharp end of looking at curriculum change and curriculum development and the most effective way to work with teachers in the classroom. You’ve got this real tension between providing equity of service spreading across and actually effective service and the two might be in opposition to each other. Or it might be very difficult to achieve equity and to achieve effective service at the same time - um - and that’s one...
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thing that I’m always thinking about and trying to work out strategies to sort of balance the two in some way, but I think it’s very difficult.

G I don’t know how general it is - I’ve got a number of exploding schools and I spend more time with those exploding schools than I do with the general run. And all the talk of equity in terms of - not that Julie supported equity - but the kind of thing that has been said in the re-structuring one of the memos that we had is that we guaranteed that a school would have the same kind of attention as others. Well I don’t think that should be real - certainly not in my area.

J Just moving back to that as well, is that when I go round schools, it’s obvious that some schools are managing all right and don’t want as much as other schools and if you give a bit more to a school that’s needing it, is that interfering with equity of service and how much is that a possibility given declining numbers of us? I don’t know.

A That’s the position we’re in, isn’t it? Because you can’t - I mean in a way you can’t guarantee between four and six days for every school. That’s actually ignoring the whole need thing and and you might actually be working with schools who need (very little help) and you don’t need to go back. They’re getting on fine, whereas a school down the road wants more than the six days and, you know, I suppose we want something of a feeling of a structure so we knew what we were doing but at the same time I think we’ve got to actually express, you know, get down the barriers and actually respond to needs because that’s what schools are paying for.

Be That’s good cultivation - the big secondary school where they had a team review in which I was involved this year there were some seventy adviser days spent on that school, so we’re not going to visit it again for the next eight years.

Laughter.

JD Yes.

Bi This is an area which is going to be absolutely crucial in the future, you know. It’s something that we’re traditionally not very good at is the process of evaluation. I mean I sense it’s something that we all do pretty much as individuals, anyway. We’re constantly doing it, but it’s not particularly systematic in the way that it’s approached and very often the information that you get back from schools can be fashioned by the questionnaire that you use or the questions that you ask. Very often it’s out of date. By the time you actually act upon it and the schools have moved on and their starting points are very different and therefore it’s not very helpful.

G Just picking up on the appraisal thing, I’ve found that quite a useful mechanism. If we can negotiate within the appraisal package, some aspect of what constitutes evidence and actually lock into what you’re doing already. I mean there are a lot of structures that we could use to get more effective evaluation going. We frequently work with each other and whether it’s for link review or task groups or a whole range of other things
and yet how often do we actually use that to get feedback in terms of our own performance or sort of effectiveness in certain situations? I mean I’ve recently put this with somebody - two colleagues on link review. I’ve worked very closely with them and yet I’ve got no real feel from them in terms of how successful I’ve been or what they feel the part they play in the process. I mean it would be fairly easy to allot some time.

JD  Yes I’m sure it would.

G  It would be fairly time-consuming, I appreciate.

JD  Can I move to another topic and ask you about your own training and whether you feel you’re getting adequate opportunities for your own development?  

Deep thought goes on every time I ask a question!

Bi  Make sure you say so!

J  I feel it’s on the job training. You know that comment about going into the link review. I feel the same about every one. (I) go into (it) thinking, ‘Will I be able to do this?’ you know, and trying to draw from it.

A  I’ve learnt a lot, a tremendous amount as a general adviser in the past three years, although ... most of the time and so I’ve gained a lot from the job and my feeling is that professional development experience ... but beyond that I’ve had no professional development opportunity at all, apart from what has been provided as being part of the advisory team. I’ve not had any individual professional development at all. ... It was turned down.

JD  Anybody else? How about induction Bill?

Bi  Well, it was infinitely better than where I came from - um - yes. I felt the induction process that I received was pretty good. I met with my line manager before I took up my post and I spent a morning with him and a programme was worked out for me and we’ve since met the same line manager on several occasions to take that process further forward. I think I was encouraged to take responsibility for that, which I did take with both hands the in-service option, but every effort was made to try where possible to service the selection panel as I was going through. I wouldn’t fault that. I mean obviously ... on-the-job training has been most dynamic as far as I’m concerned and with other colleagues as well in various contexts.

Be  Yes. I wouldn’t want to under-estimate that at all. But the import of Cooper, Lybrand, Deloite to work with us on appraisal was a catastrophe and I don’t feel that I haven’t had opportunities either, but I do have views about in-service education and all that stuff. When I look back - I’m getting old and when I look back at what has had most effect on me - um - in terms of my professional development, they were not sought and they were not planned and they were crucial, so the whole business, for example, now, of
saying as one might, hypothetically, we're all managers now, let's all go and do a course in management somewhere. I don't know whether that would do me much good but I feel not. Whereas the kind of serendipity that we've had in area teams, less as a whole service, much less, so much better and contacts because of review needs. For example, tonight I'm talking to a staff about a report which is now agreed, on early writing - teacher intervention and support on early writing. I had to learn a lot about that before I went into the link. I didn't become expert on it but at least I knew what language we're using. That's not very coherent what I've said but -

A When I look back over three years I've learnt more in three years than I've ever learnt in any three years in my professional life before but I don't feel that professional development with a capital P and a capital D is answerable or provided. I don't think there the opportunities have necessarily been made, certainly not for me. I don't know whether that's because there hasn't been anything that would have been profitable, but it's not been there. But if I was asked on an application form what courses I'd been to in the last two years, I haven't got anything to put down, directly - I've run courses and learnt through them I haven't actually gone as a learner to any situation and it's probably very demanding teaching them and learning through teaching rather than learning through being a learner. I've been outside the authority twice in three years.

JD Julie?

J I think my routine is somewhat different. I came from secondary schools and I've been an advisory teacher and there I gathered lots of expertise in the curriculum area and it was at the time when the National Curriculum was coming in and that was an enormous learning curve and then moving into being an adviser was absolutely amazing, mind boggling. And I must say that perhaps I felt that because I came from the background I did, I hadn't got certain skills. I hadn't been a head. I wouldn't say that I'd got management skills. I'd managed myself. I'd managed the work, things like that and I still feel an inadequacy there. I've been on some courses, but they're mainly to do with my curriculum area and that's been my strength in that I could say, 'Right my expertise is there,' and that's quite comforting and that's what curriculum advisers find quite comforting - they've got their expertise. It may not be in other areas. I'm not quite sure how I'm - - But in terms of other people being supportive - people I've worked with and in particular, Keith was amazingly supportive, the adviser at that time and I've learnt a tremendous amount from him. And then through working with other people. It's an amazing learning curve.

JD Right. Yes.

G It's quite difficult to actually plan your professional development in terms of - well particularly when the climate's so uncertain. I mean, you're not clear where things are going to in a whole range of directions and therefore forgetting the system, you look at what it is that you might need other than the general role that we perform and being reactive to that role to the outputs of that role.
JD What about the - um - is there a need for something that helps you with the cross-phase role because most people tend to come from one phase and then find themselves faced with other phases to deal with? Is there any need for work there? Maybe not the present group, but maybe with other groups.

J I hadn’t had any experience of teaching primary schools when I started as an advisory teacher and what I did to begin with, well I was working with another advisory teacher and we both decided to get some primary - get into primary and we rang up and said could we come in and observe and get involved and that really helped because then we got - I would say that I worked ever such a lot in primary that year. I built up a lot of ...which was very useful.

JD So you actually laid on your own staff development.

J Yes.

JD What do other people think about this phase thing?

Bi I think there was possibly a problem with schools with inspections in the early stages particularly in secondary schools -

Be No, not particularly with secondary schools.

JD No

Bi Well, my perspective was that the majority of secondary schools had this notion that they wanted specialist reports and generalist roles were soggy. That’s changed, I think. But no, working across the spectrum - if teaching and learning is the real focus of what we’re doing then it’s a matter of sorting that out in terms of our particular focus.

Be Yes. I agree with Bill really, in that I think the secondary schools tend still to be singing the same tune - that they can do very well without their general adviser, thank you, and what they want and what they will pay for is curriculum advice. But I for one, hear that refrain still, fairly often. In the run up to extended review and the re-structuring as it was then, it was primary colleagues largely, who were saying, we want primary heads in the team as our general advisers.

A I mean I actually don’t perceive any difficulty with the idea in working across phase. I think it’s an issue of credibility. I don’t have any difficulty with the idea. When you’re located in an authority where advisers had always worked cross phase for years as general advisers - I mean it was never - I mean as a head and a teacher, you didn’t ever question the background of an adviser. It was whether they were good advisers or not and what they could offer the school and I’ve no idea when that authority went cross phase. I started in 1971 and the general adviser attached to the school happened to be a secondary home economics adviser. It didn’t make any difference. She was valued as a highly skilled person who could have an overview of the school. So I come from a
background where that wasn’t a problem. I don’t think it should be a problem in theory. At the point of change over then obviously there are difficulties in credibility and understanding what the role is and I think that the question of general support versus specialist support, there’s two different issues. I actually think there is a need for both. There’s a need for somebody who has an overview and is a link with the school, but there is a need for specialist support. I couldn’t go and talk to a secondary school about language teaching or O level. It’s not my strength, but that doesn’t mean I don’t feel there’s a need for somebody to have an overview of the school.

JD Yes

Be I thought we were all talking about perceptions, not necessarily ours which might not have been answering your question. Certainly we are all talking about what we saw to be the perception of the school.

JD A different sort of question - I'm conscious that the time is almost up. But how far do you feel - or what sort of a feel have you got for the climate and culture of the team. I mean do you, you know - feel that there is a team climate, there is a team culture that you’re part of?

Pause.

JD You must be aware of this coming in Bill. You must be aware of whether there is something of this sort or not.

Bi I feel a team culture in terms of the area team. I’m not convinced - I haven’t sampled the same feeling in a wide context to a certain extent. I mean that’s probably a lot to do with the fact that I’ve been incredibly busy and we’ve only actually been together as a whole group on a couple of occasions since I’ve been here. That situation may change so I’m ready to couch what I’m saying very carefully in terms of a limited experience of a new culture which has actually moved on in the time that I’ve been away from it.

V I think the chief point to develop is where your team is, where you feel your team is especially in terms of the teachers that you work with. I think it depends on your prime - with the varied working and must be part of area team and part of an area team will in effect put out part of the education service into the education department. I don’t feel aware that we’re going and find that very hard to work outside the branch and yet knowing that we’ve got to work outside the branch. The branch structure’s going to disappear.

JD Yes. But you sound as if you feel that the branch has its own climate and culture.

V Er - I think ANT - the advisory and inspection team works developing a team approach, as have some of the area teams and as have some of the curriculum teams and Bernard will have a team of people that he works with. -um - but I’m not sure whether there is a feeling all those other teams are part of a service that is driving forward in a coherent way, but I think as advisory and inspection team we’re getting somewhere near it. We’re
fumbling our way towards it. As an education department I just don’t know where we’re going.

A I feel a sense of belonging with certain people outside the advisory and inspection branch particularly schools’ branch. I mean I - perhaps I’ve been fortunate, I don’t know, but I’ve worked with a number of link officers whose views, thoughts and different perspectives I value very, very highly and that I feel I’ve worked very closely with them and that we have worked - it might be a team of two working with a school but we have worked with some team. At the moment I have only have one of the link officers that I relate to. In the past I’ve had more and I’ve found that, I’ve found working with the link officers extremely helpful and very supportive. I generally find that with the limited numbers of people across the department I’ve worked with.

When I came, I still hear, and I came to (this county) three years ago, I still hear people talking about that (it) has a special culture and a special gift. I don’t have any feel for that. I don’t know what that means.

J Absolute heresy. Somebody was saying it to me on the phone yesterday. It happens to be someone that also wrote to the authority and talking about....She was saying well (the county) has a set of values and aims and a feel about it that is very important. I don’t often see it. I found it a welcoming authority to come into. I found it a very human authority. I don’t know that I feel in that sense it is very different from the authority I came from but I still don’t know what people mean when they say ‘(This county) is special. It has a special something.’

G If I can speak on it, I mean I sensed that very strongly when I came back having been out because the culture is very, very different and similarly I couldn’t a way of putting my finger on what was different, but there is a difference and it’s very noticeable when you return back. There’s a sense of a partnership, in a way that I’ve not experienced in another LEA. There a mutual trust and a regard for children in a way that I hadn’t experienced in another LEA as well - very significant. But other than that I haven’t really put my finger on it.

Be I remember walking into (another authority’s) advisory office and - er - and noting all the men - and they were all men - had suits on. I said to the chap I had come to work with, ‘I’ve noticed you’ve all got suits on.’ he said, ‘Oh yes we have to wear suits.’ And I think about (this county) you might say with Alan Bennett, they make us wear what we like.

Laughter.

Be You ask a difficult question about culture at a time when we’re being told quite specifically that we must change culture in the sense of the way we think, feel and act. As with any group of people, staff anywhere, you would find a lot of things which are held in common some of which would correspond to the - er - aims and principles which they’ve laid down and others less so, so you’d have a range about the way people think, feel and act and to be told to change the way you think, feel and act is an interesting proposition.
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Discussion with primary headteachers
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JD I'd really like to start off with how often do you see members of the advisory team - the inspectorate I'm talking about first of all, in your school. With what frequency do they come?

Ph I think they're quite regular. By appointment. Usually with me they set up appointments for the whole term. I've only been there fifteen months, but it seems to be on a very regular basis.

JD Uhu.

C For me it's different maybe because I'm switching inspectors, but I've seen inspectors very rarely. In two weeks time I've a full inspection, no, in three weeks time.

L I'm new to the authority and my attached inspector to the school changed when I took up headship there so I've seen my inspector almost once a month since I've been there since January and that pre-booked by appointment and the times vary according, according his work.

JD Yes.

Pa Mrs Hunter rings and we have regular visits at least two per half term, but she's been in more frequently than that, I think probably because we're so near she is inclined to pop in if she wants things for display or check something. So on a formal basis it's twice per half term. On an informal basis it's more often than that.

JD Yes. What about you?

J I'm in special education and we have a special needs inspector and I suppose the booking is something less than once a month - er - a visit by appointment in a formal way and - um - but on the other hand, I think we meet at least once a fortnight one way or another for meetings or -

JD What is your reaction to the visits that you get from your inspectors?

L My personal impression is one of support and a chance to air things perhaps - um - as a new head, I wasn't sure of, so I query things and really have a confidential heart to heart, if you like and so it's quite a pastoral visit. As time's gone by that's sort of
shifted stance somewhat in looking at the school and its developments and the visit will be - it's caught my thoughts on the way the school should be moving forward, so it's slightly shifted gear although there is that element of support, advisory capacity within that. It's gaining more momentum to become looking at the school as a whole.

C Mine’s slightly different because I took up the post in September and in that time I’ve had one pastoral visit from my inspector - um - and one visit from the senior primary inspector, but my inspector has now changed and I think it was just the situation that was a bit difficult at the time. -um - Ask me again after the inspection and I might change my mind!

JD What about you, Philip?

Ph I think initially - um - I worked for a previous authority. I had two headships for my sins, both within that authority. Coming to Kingston was a completely new ball game for me, new authority, different type of school and first impressions were again one of support and mutual respect, I found. I got that impression certainly, that they were talking one to one in professional terms. I think the starting point was perhaps slightly different because of my previous experience. They expected me perhaps to be - I won’t say more competent, but certainly my previous experience that was taken into account - um - and so I felt that the sort of conversations that took place in the early days were ones of looking at the vision that I might have for the school and how I was going to actually implement that and I think the support was there, yes, but at a lower level, maybe.

JD Yes, yes, quite.

J We’ve had our current inspector for a year and five months and when she took up the post from my side I suppose I was most anxious to convey and - um - get her to appreciate really what we were for, what our school was about and what our methods were and so on and we’ve had quite a number of hours of discussion about this. Now I’m feeling that - um - she knows what we’re for and what we’re about and our methods and so on and I welcome her visits and her support.

JD Pauline?

Pa Ours really take two different forms.- um - we’ve had ones really where the inspector’s come in with a task in mind, like the early years review, looking at the school development plan and then running alongside that she’s been looking at my actual staff and very supportive in that I do have one problem member of staff - a long running problem member of staff and - er - the inspector’s actually worked on that very well. She looks, you know, went in, observed, came back to me and has gone in there with ideas, so I would certainly say they have become very supportive. I’ve seen a great change over the years that I’ve been here in that now it is more regular. It is more organised and it certainly is more constructive - critical but constructive.

JD Yes.
Well, the old mode that I had been used to was not critical and that was quite difficult to work with. I think someone who comes in with something to say and makes good and valid criticisms is actually more helpful than somebody who comes in and says it's all lovely. We aren't actually any of us perfect and - er - we found that although at first staff found it a little bit difficult to deal with, having been used to the smile and the nod, once they got used to the idea that somebody was coming and going to say things that would actually be helpful, I found it very, very supportive.

Yes. You're all being very positive about your inspectorate. Are there any negative things that you would say?

She doesn't always remember what she's actually come to see us about. You suddenly find you've switched horses in the middle, but - um -

Laughter.

Something that came to my attention this week and I hadn't really been aware of it. The staff don't necessarily share the same view of the inspector coming into school as I do at the moment. It's quite interesting in terms of thinking on a negative tack that they found it quite threatening but this could possibly be in the history of the school that I am now head of that they have been through quite significant difficult times and difficult changes of late and they felt very much put under the microscope and I viewed it from the other perspective of helping me not quite as a mentor but as a guide, a) into the authority because I've never worked in Kingston before, so that was a change for me and b) in my first headship that I welcomed that as a critical friend as Pauline said, but very caring within my personal needs as well.

Yes.

That could be a negative.

Yes. How have other people's staffs reacted?

My staff are very good. We've got a follow up inspection coming and the original inspection hadn't been very good so, my staff are still there from that original inspection, are quite negative on a lot of things. Though why are they coming in? I say it's me they're coming in to see, not you, when they do come. I think they do find it difficult some of them because you know, I think they're just on edge. They're not sure and because of that that we had before, it's a historical thing as Lyn says, because we've been under the microscope they get very twitchy.

Yes.

Well, we've had very big change of staff during the last eighteen months. More than fifty per cent of the staff have gone, either to retirement or to other jobs and so the vast majority of the staff are reasonably new along with me and they've got nothing
historical to base it on. They give the appearance of, ‘Well anybody can come in at any time’ and whether that’s just...I’m not too sure because whenever they know they’re due to be inspected if it’s their year group is being looked at - um - you do notice a little bit more activity than is normally associated with their general weekly routines. They’re more particular to make sure that the ledges are a bit straighter than they would normally be - to make I good impression I guess, but deep down they see the inspectorate as there to help.

I think one of the problems, which maybe - I don’t know if I’m speaking for others but I see a problem is where you have an inspectorate service that on the one hand advise and on the other hand inspect and the same person can be doing both so that though they may only be wearing one hat at a time but you know that there is always the other hat that they can put on and so it has to be clearly defined prior to a visit as to whether they’re there in a pastoral or advisory capacity or whether it is actually inspectorial. And I think this could be a problem. I’ve not met it as a problem yet, but I know on the early years survey, certainly, I was quite keen to identify whether it was inspectorial or in an advisory capacity because I think there is a definite difference between the two concerns.

Pa I think can also be an advantage though, can’t it? I mean, we’ve - it’s been helpful to us when the inspector has come in and made a formal inspectorial visit, particularly in the case of my member of staff who is the weak link in the chain - um - wearing the other hat, the inspector’s been able to come back in an advisory capacity, so in a way, there are strengths and weaknesses, aren’t there?

Ph That’s right. It’s better than saying, ‘Well, the inspection’s there. That’s the report’ and somebody else comes in and says, ‘Well, look we can we discuss these points.’

Pa Or nobody else comes in.

Ph Yes and strategies to do whatever is recommended. I think that’s right. - er - I think it depends on how people view it. I mean some people just if you or I maybe walk into the classroom alters the way that they perform let alone somebody from the authority.

JD Very definitely. For a head walking in, you can’t possibly - you alter it for both children and teacher, don’t you?

Ph That’s right. I think it’s the way that management structures are set up in school.

J I don’t think I’d alter anything. I’m walking in and out all day. I don’t think they see you’re not there.

Pa It depends on the physical set up, doesn’t it. Because with our physical set up I am in the rooms more often than I’m not.

JD Yes. Your children and I expect John’s children to some extent are probably less conscious of status, though they do get conscious of it pretty young.
J I don't go along with the thing of difference between, certainly locally. I can see a difference last time I had an HMI which was a year or two years ago coming in for a day to do something specific. She then said, 'I would like to see these things - two teachers of these age groups doing so and so' and this was a part of the investigation into the National Curriculum and these documents. Now that's very clear cut and that's an inspection - no doubt about it. She didn't stay to give any advice - just did it and went. But that's a fairly rare event. I mean, you don't often get those and from the school's point of view, it's nice to be on your toes and have to do this, but you really expect to gain anything in terms of advice or whatever. Whereas with LEA inspectors or advisers I really cannot stop to distinguish what role they're playing, not really so far. We've got an inspection (and) I may change this. We've got one coming up in a month as well. So far, I've never been really aware of a role.

JD Yes.

J They've just been people coming, talking and going back. Earlier it's true in the borough for those who've been heads for some time here, that's there's been a marked change within the past three or four years, I don't know exactly. Either that was National Curriculum or Education Act inspired or a change of people, or both. But it's certainly far more positive now in terms of visits and frequency and knowing people really, knowing inspectors. It was, in the past, I might not see one for two or three years and then it would be coming to borrow something or - nothing to do with looking at children working.

JD Yes.

Ph I can say, do you think the fact that we have so many meetings these days that we're rubbing shoulders with them much more frequently than perhaps we did in the past and perhaps the smallness of the authority that it has become that much more intimate.

Pa I think it's also been influenced by, without going into any details, by the actual leadership of the whole education team. We went through what I look back now as a very bad patch when we had aggressive, rubbing everybody up the wrong way at the very top of the education team. (He) went on to higher things, bless his heart, but he was no great friend to us when he was here. - um - Since the new Director's taken over, I think, you know, you lead from the top, and my feeling is that the real change was a little bit in place before that but the benefits of the change have come since then. Now I mean that's a personal opinion but I've certainly seen a difference reflected. I mean, our meetings are so different for a start. You weren't rubbing shoulders in a friendly manner before, were we?

Ph You can't compare it. You can't compare it.

C I mean also we had that gap with five inspectors for a while, didn't we and I didn't have one.
The other point you raised about different attitudes of staff. I think that's very true because teaching staff don't see inspectors as often. At meetings, I mean, we always see them every time they come. Staff may see them only by chance or when they're actually being looked at for an hour. Then it's influenced exactly by what happens during that time. So, for instance, I've got a really excellent teacher who - there was a recent review of our school, about staffing and children's needs and so on and because I'd said in advance, 'Now this is nothing to do with you, the teacher being assessed. They're coming to look at children and to assess children's special needs.' Right, we all accepted that, but the inspector, at the end of that period, I think mistakenly, gave a little slip, as usual, about notes on the lesson, which quite affected that teacher and I think still does. I mean it was publicised in advance that we're coming to check on children's needs and then to give her a slip, affects her, now, opinion of inspectors.

JD Why did she find that upsetting?

I think it made a difference in the way she behaved. Now, it shouldn't, the fact was, you see I said, 'Very often people come into a school, if you are on top' - and she is on top of the job. She has about four children who are EBD (which) is a polite way of putting it, very, very difficult. They're all on the child guidance list. They go to the clinic, have outside help and she maintains a class including those children. I said, 'It's rather important for people assessing needs to be made aware of the fact. Otherwise they come in and say, 'Well, you're doing a marvellous job and there's no problem here, is there?' and walk away again. At one point she had even left the room, with an assistant left, but had taken a group out and really devised her own programme for this visit as I'd suggested to demonstrate things, which was rather different to demonstrating her professional expertise, had somebody said, 'Now you're in charge, just show what you can do?'

JD Yes. I understand

I'm just saying that that is an incident which colours a teacher's views for some time.

JD Yes, yes. I can well understand that.

Pa I think knowing the inspector does too, because it was quite interesting with us. The chief inspector here actually had not visited us for many, many, many years, not since she was chief inspector and a visit was arranged and my staff found that much more worrying than our attached inspector. Now, she was actually coming to see me and she was going to look through the school, obviously. She hadn't seen it for some years. But the staff found that much more worrying and when unfortunately she had to cancel at the last minute the staff were absolutely furious because, you know, they'd got themselves tensed up for her coming and it was quite interesting to see and I think that's because they all know the attached inspector. You know we have the early years conference at the beginning of each school year in September, so even people that had only just come into the borough know the attached inspector. They've also met the
special needs inspector and other people like that on that conference. Never met the chief inspector and then for her not to come was looked upon as really dreadful because they were so keyed up for her coming. So I think in a way it's knowing somebody, whatever their role, it's actually knowing the person does have a certain effect.

JD Yea. I'm sure that's right. Makes a lot of difference. I think I'd like to go on from there and ask you a bit about advisory teachers and your views of them. Have you all had advisory teachers at some time working in your schools? What's your view of those been?

Laughter.

C I was an advisory teacher in this authority.

Ph Some of them are terrible I think!

C Thank you, thank you!

JD Well I hope we won't embarrass you!

C It's all right. I've had a lot of advisory teachers in since September ... but my staff are very appreciative of all the help they get. Where I think it helped me when I came in September was that my staff actually knew me from that role so it was a case of you know 'Look who we've now got, she can cope with this' Which was nice in one way.

JD Yes. It gave you a credibility to start off with. What about the rest of you?

Ph The comment that I seem to hear from the advisory teachers that come in is, 'I don't know how you manage to do the job' - head of the school, running the school and everything that goes with it these days. We haven't had, as far as I'm aware, anyway, during the time I've been here, every part of the advisory service used, but the ones we've had in have always been very helpful, negotiated with every member of staff whom they're going to be attached to, usually through me and set up a programme of work or worked alongside, or whatever, negotiated the terms that their coming in and been very useful and the work that they've done with the staff actually has then been passed on to other members of staff within the school. So I feel from that point of view they've done what was set out, advisory teachers, advising staff on perhaps a particular part of the curriculum and then spinning it off for the rest of the school. That's the positive side I can think of at the moment. I might think of the negative side

L Yes, I have. Quite limited in terms of the length of time I've been at the school, but the best support we've had is in the SATS and our moderator coming in and — er - that's been very useful to enable discussion with the teacher who's conducting the SATS and me and also she came to support us at a parents' meeting and gave input
at that meeting so in that her function was really greatly appreciated but it seems to be like Philip said, it depends how many you've had in and what their role is in terms of support and I think that's the crunch. It's the difference perhaps between the advisory teacher and the inspectorate. Their credibility is one usually of coming from a class - they've had class teaching experience and it's very much that they're coming to help me as a teacher, support my ability within the classroom and to provide fresh eyes and input in very practical terms and it's not a paper inspectorial type report. - Um - But it does vary as to who comes in, the personality and their background as to how they're viewed by the staff. That's been quite distinctly obvious. I think that's partially because it's a small authority and I came from a much bigger authority with bigger team of advisory staff where here, everybody seems to know of everyone and where they come from and their background and I've heard various comments, both plus and minuses in that respect. All I can say is that at the moment, yes, we've had good support and good service.

Ph  I was just thinking of the lim - It has been quite limited the use that we've had, I think, I'm trying to think how big the advisory service is. It is reducing rapidly, I know, that's been noted.

JD  It's about twelve - something like that.

Ph  Yea, but - um - I'm trying to think that those that we've had in, we've had in because we valued them and maybe because we didn't get people in, we felt that their contribution was already in place in the school.

Pa  We haven't had many in, partly because - it came to light when we were talking about the questionnaires that you sent. Not many advisory staff actually have all that much experience of the young children. Where they've been used and my staff have greatly appreciated them has been INSET type situation. The only occasion when they have actually come into school, they have walked away saying, 'We have learnt things.' So as a support working within the school with the children - I'm not saying we haven't had any - we had a couple of very good occasions, but it hasn't really been as useful to my staff. On the other hand from their own professional development point of view going on the twilight or the early years' course in September where advisory staff have worked, that has been very useful, but it's really been a matter of looking at what the advisory staff have been putting forward and our adapting it to the young children.

JD  Yes.

Pa  I mean, not at the moment so much, but where it did fall down for us was the special educational needs. Because when we, quite a little while ago now, asked for help from the advisory staff, because at that point the system, the way the system rolled was that you were expected to go to the advisory staff before you went any further in asking for help with a child and actually that was a complete waste of time because they were unable to offer us anything. But as I say, in the role of putting on twilight course, or
coming in to us when we’ve asked for it as an INSET day - the other nursery and I have set things up between us, it’s been good. It’s been positive and staff have come back to me and said, you know ‘It was worth while.’ But from a personal point of view, a professional point of view, not from an ‘I am going to go and do what she said in the classroom.’

JD No. I understand. What about you, John?

J I think the first advisory teacher was from our school, about twenty years ago - a part timer was first special educational needs adviser and became full time and - er - well, I think our attitude is generally positive. It’s a good service - um - it’s difficult to talk about a whole team. You say there are twelve now and there’ve been more. There are individual differences aren’t there and there would be in a team, so we perceive some to be weaker than others although that may be us as well. - um - I think, it must be said, we should be kind to them, - not to you personally (to C)- when they’ve been one step ahead in the National Curriculum. I mean, I don’t know, that must be quite an ordeal, when you are lumbered with a hall full of people all waiting to hear the latest on Key Stage 1.

L Specially when the orders arrive in the middle of actually doing the training.

J Staff actually thirsting for blood and yours is the nearest. So I’ve actually said, you know, you’ve got to be kind. They’ve got to do their bit as well. So we have felt sorry for them at times when they’ve got lumbered with jobs to be done and they’re one step ahead of us. - um - I don’t know, about special needs, we never see ours.

JD Let me ask you a very naughty question. I mean you are aware that there is cutting local government staff right, left and centre. If you had to choose between cutting inspectors or advisory teachers, which would you choose?

Pa Because we don’t use the service so much, I would immediately say we’ll cut the advisory teachers and keep the inspectors, if it’s got to be one or the other but that’s a very personal point of view in that we don’t use the advisory teacher service anywhere near as much as we use the inspectorate.

J I would choose the inspectorate too because I can remember most of my career as being without advisory teachers, so at one time we didn’t have them so we could be the same again.

Ph As long as there’s a good LEA it wouldn’t make sense to me not to have an inspectorate.

L I’d miss advisory teacher support. Having said that, if the role of the inspector were maintained and expanded to incorporate the advisory capacity within that I would be happy to retain it, but that’s the best of both worlds, I know, but we’re doing this all the time, cutting one and saying, ‘But carry on.’ You can’t do that. There comes a limit. So I suppose if the push becomes a shove yes, I’d keep the inspectorate.
JD What’s your picture of the effective inspector?

L (To C.) You’ve kept very quiet. (to JD) You ought to have asked her.

JD Well, I’ve deliberately haven’t asked her because I’ve said she was an interested party.

Pa Like the councillors who go and sit outside.

L I’m on the other side because I haven’t in a way had the support from the inspectorate that the rest of you have had. I mean I think what I would look at I mean, yes it’s very difficult because I’ve got a foot in both camps now, I think I would actually overhaul both because - um - I can remember when we had one primary inspector and then we didn’t have a primary inspector, but we still had all the secondary ones which with the best will in the world couldn’t give us all the support that the primary schools needed - um - I can’t seen their role being expanded to take on advisory work and having said that I’d rather have the LEA inspectorate for inspection. At least you feel that they can back you up and come in and support between one thing and another which an outsider won’t be able to do.

JD Do you feel, those of you who’ve been in the county some time that there has been a loss of support because of the accent on inspection? Do you feel you’re getting less support?

Pa I personally think we’re getting more

JD Uhhu. So it’s probably better organised.

Pa Hang on a minute. Not necessarily more, more effective support.

JD Yes.

Pa Yes, definitely more effective support.


JD That’s good. What about INSET? How effective do you think the in-service programme of the authority is?

Laughter.

Ph Silence.

Pa Iffy butty, iffy butty, if you want words.

C Where I think it may have gone wrong this year is the way we’ve been given a number of days. Well what they’ve done now is, you can bid in for the number of days you want advisory teacher time for each subject,
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Yes.

When I was in my other life, we very much looked at it that way. We could only provide a day per school. Therefore that’s what we offered and I think they’re going to hit trouble because they’re not going to be able to provide the amount.

They have. I knew from day one.

Whereas they have two areas that have already done it - an entitlement of one day per school because that was all we could afford to give. Now I think schools, in a way, valued that...when the day and that was negotiated. Whereas now I think it’s very much people put a bid in for what they wanted and they’re not going to get it and I think many were having trouble a very long time before I came into this one...but they do actually come in and negotiate with you where I know colleagues in other authorities are told who they’re going to see and what they’re going to do. But it is quite good. You can’t always fit in right.

It’s quite difficult this in-service because schools are at different - styles of their development, aren’t they? At one school I’d need a particular input in certain areas. In another maybe ahead of that. If you’re looking at in-service as a whole across the authority to actually hit it right is virtually impossible I would have said. I think that’s one of the problems that they’ve got. It’s not their fault. - um - As Chris says, the individual bidding is a problem this year. They’ve mismanaged basically. They haven’t got the right information before going out to tender with the schools. So I think that’s a problem. I think some of the courses that have been put on in the past have not always been at the appropriate level. I can think of several courses which some of my staff have been to and they felt disappointed coming away thinking they were not going to get - I don’t know - more information or I guess learnt something that they hadn’t thought about. Now that, as John says, might be the individual person going in some ways, their expectations being too great.

It might also be the way the course is advertised.

Basically, one of the problems is that we’ve had this 1988 Act, National Curriculum coming in and a welter of material, courses, new learning everybody to try and grapple with and that’s not just teachers, heads, inspectors, advisory, everybody’s desperately trying to keep their head above water, trying to do a good job. Inevitably in the nature of the beast we’re going to fail in some areas and we’re all desperate to succeed and we’re all desperate for new learning, I suppose. It’s a real problem.

There’s tremendous resentment as well, I mean, coming back from courses, some ‘Well, it’s all right for them, it’s all they’re looking at - this one aspect’ - I mean they go for this talk, yes and they go hoping to be open minded and to get support and help to bring back to the classroom but I think there’s resentment because generally the pressure is so great to observe all the initiatives that are coming through from the government now in terms of curriculum and it does make people very resentful when they’re juggling with so much and they feel the child is not at the centre any more.
JD Yes.

Ph I think it's interesting listening to teachers who've been good solid class teachers for a real number of years - twenty odd years of education or more. You ask them, you know, 'Well, what's different?' - you know - 'Children come and they're still children and my methods of the past are still working now. Do we need all this change?' and they'll perhaps because they find it more difficult to change and be a bit more flexible in their teaching approach will still, at the end of an academic year, come out with results which are comparable with people who are more modern in attitude. That's my experience.

JD Yes.

Pa I think for a little while - they're actually - National Curriculum apart because we've not been involved directly in the National Curriculum, there actually was too much, too many courses put on offer in Kingston, both day, twilight - it was just more than - well - a school like ours, where we've basically got five people, two of them part time - who could attend. We simply couldn't - I couldn't expect my staff to cover everything that was on offer. If you go back about eighteen months, two years, there really was too much going on. Now we asked for everything to be reorganised because the other thing that was happening was that things were happening two things on the same night that applied to the same people and - um - I think their efforts now to have this bidding system is to try to get over that but as you say it hasn't really worked.

I also think actually that teachers are too quiet. - um - I've had staff come back and say, 'It was a waste of time,' and if you go back about four years there was an occasion when something was set up for sort of a series of twilight ones and at the second, I think it was the second of four there was a concerted walk out because people felt that it was not what had been advertised. It wasn't up to the standard that staff expected. Now that's the only time in all the years that I've been here that I've actually known that to happen but I think it was a salutary lesson to the people that had put that on and I think actually staff are often too, too biddable and too pleasant and don't make their opinion - they may say it when they get back to us but they don't necessarily say it at the time and place that would have the right effect.

JD Yes.

C They weren't on our courses. Maybe because they knew us. Some of our two day courses were very rough rides - which I think was right, I mean, I think there's a lot coming out of those last few we did that had to come out somewhere and we were getting it.

Ph Yes. You just happened to be on the receiving end.

L Was that the National Curriculum?

C That was some of our science two day courses for the National Curriculum for the
class teachers. Some of them were really - which I think is right, I mean they were, now, I don’t know, we were sometimes wondering it’s almost - er - a backhanded compliment in a way that they can say what they can say because of the relationship they had with us and we had some pretty rough rides.

L Were you prepared to argue it out with them?

C Well maybe, but with some of the others I didn’t think it worth it. I know I’ve come back and thought ‘Never again!’

L It’s difficult isn’t it?

Ph You know, you offer a course and you don’t know who’s going to come to it and you don’t know for what position they going to come, do you?

L No. It is one of the problems.

J I’m not in a position to disagree because you know more about the bidding part than I do but my feelings are fairly positive in that we have meetings or informal gatherings or whatever of senior staff and we agree to do an INSET day on a given topic PSE or humanities or whatever and ‘Let’s fix a day, let’s look at the calendar, and they say, ‘Well we’ll have one in February, one in May and one in July or something,’ and then we’ve been fairly successful in approaching the advisory service ‘Can you supply or naming someone - can you come on that day? Do this in the morning and somebody else in the afternoon’ and as far as I know we’ve been fairly successful for the past couple of years and that’s bidding in a way.

C I think it’s this latest one - the latest system where because we actually used to - whereas this time they didn’t limit the total number of days you could have for the school, but they didn’t actually say that the advisory teachers themselves could only cover X number of schools, so I think, I mean this is where I know they hit problems this time because people quite rightly, because as Philip said, they come at different stages. They may say they need six days of maths, for example, and there’s no way that the advisory teacher can get round the school that put in for that.

J It’s a bit - er - it’s difficult to plan.

L It’s a bit tight, as well, the times you need them.

J You might have a very good advisory teacher in history and because for a fluke nobody sort of wants history this year, particularly, they’re presumably left in the cold, are they or -

Pa From what I picked up on the grapevine I don’t think any of them have been left in the cold.
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Ph I was going to say, it could have shown up actually an area of weakness within the advisory service because nobody wanted it because it was a weak area.

J You can’t always tell.

Ph No you can’t. It could be because of your particular aspirations.

C No I think the individual bidding for INSET days, most people in the past have got what they wanted. I can think of one that went wrong.

Ph Well, within reason it worked.

JD I’d like to ask you a much more general question. I said to you at the beginning that what I’m looking at is effectiveness as far as advisers are concerned using the word in its broad sense. What’s your idea of an effective inspector? What’s your picture of the inspector who is effective?

L Someone who is quite clear in their philosophy in terms of education. Somebody who comes in with clear cut views of education in terms of not being very theoretical with airy fairy textbook ideas but someone also who may not necessarily be in parallel with the headteacher’s and the school’s philosophy and understanding of education but is prepared to listen but has their own clear cut ideas as well, someone who isn’t into beating about the bush and delivering airy fairy ideas but can be supportive and listen and guide you and the school. They have their view and you have your view and the two can work together without clashing. - um - You’re coming back to John’s philosophy if you like of an inspector who can support the school and help lead the school on.

JD I think that’s very good. Has anybody got anything they’d like to add to that?

C The thing I think to add to that is that they are somebody yes, have got those views but have also got the tact and diplomacy to know when to say. I mean we had an unfortunate situation where something was said very wrong and it’s destroyed totally relationship. - um - They’ve got be able to almost know when to say it and when not. I think we’ve all got to be able to do that but I think the effective inspector has got to have that extra bit.

Ph I was just going to mention the fact that I’m not sure I’d judge all inspectors on this but I would expect them to be able to just walk into a classroom and be able to relate to the children. I think that’s an important part of their work and I think if they lose sight of that aspect of it then they actually can’t do the other. It’s a very important part. Inspector just to barge in - but obviously expect them to sit down with children and understand the position that the children come from and their individual problems because they’re very different in 1992 to what they would be in 1940, 42 or 44 or whenever the Education Act was.
JD  How would you know?

Laughter

Ph  I've read about it you see. But obviously things do change.

Everybody talking and laughing together

J  There's a difference in attitudes.

Ph  But I think the social asp - the social world is moving so quickly and it's so different now to when I was a child and being taught that I think it important that we all understand. Unless we do we're going to lose touch with the way children react in our schools and why they do.

JD  Could you add to that Pauline?

Pa  Not a lot, no, I think just two things. I think the effective one is one that you see the results of their visits afterwards. I think that's quite a thing to judge them by. And the other is the one that like you were saying, whether or not they agree with what they see going on, at least at the end of the time, the staff feel that they valued what they saw that was good and that perhaps they can see the value in some things that aren't necessarily all the rage at the moment and are prepared to listen to why the teacher values that particular aspect. But I think in a way the being able to walk in afterwards and seeing what is different since they visited is a good value judgement of their effect.

L  If they can't you point it out to them and say 'Come and see what we've done.'

Pa  No, I was meaning my seeing a difference.

L  Oh I see.

Pa  Yes. Their seeing the difference as well. We've had a couple of horrendous HMI experiences that I won't go into now when I haven't actually thought they looked at what they've seen at all or seen what they were looking at.

Laughter and all talking together

Pa  No. I meant my seeing the effect of their having been in.

L  You've got a new target to develop and carry it through. Yes.

JD  You got anything you want to add to that, John?

J  Um - I think the points have all been covered. Perhaps these are different words. I think they're able to make one thing that they have a positive involvement in this school.
They know a bit about it and they come in ready to ask how so and so is getting on or pick up where they left off if you like. They’re positively involved. They’re not just walking in coldly. I think what they say has to be relevant to our needs, not again, as somebody’s already said, something else on a different plane. It’s got to be relevant. They should be able to support and advise constructively. I don’t think that’s adding any more. It’s just the same sort of thing.

Ph  Associate member of the club, aren’t they?

JD  You seem to be pretty positive about things in the inspectorate by and large. Do you think that is a view that is representative of your colleagues? I mean, how representative do you think the views you’re expressing are? Because in a way, you’ve been, been -

C  I don’t really know but I think it is fairly positive but I wouldn’t like to say.

Ph  I would have said so, I mean in the short time I’ve been here I would have said so. I certainly coming into the authority new found it very uplifting actually to have a supportive network that existed and was in place. In a bigger authority you don’t see them quite as often. You don’t feel the emotional support.

JD  Have we left anything unsaid which ought to be said? I’ve finished all the things that I was planning to ask.

L  Something in the information you sent us in which you asked about buying in services to do with the inspectorate particularly. I would worry very much if we had to buy in from industry, for example, where panels were set up to come and inspect schools. I would really sincerely worry because it would wipe out all the examples we’ve just been giving you. - um - They would be coming in cold. They would not necessarily be objective not even, if this government has its way, be professionals.

JD  Yes. Though I think the idea is only that one person within each team shouldn’t be a professional and where that’s been tried it certainly seems to have been less worrying than it sounds, but - um - I do appreciate that there is a problem.

L  I think we’re heading down this route of fundamental changes all round - again - and it’s just another thing that - the concern, the anticipation of what the change involves and when you’ve got used to a certain network and are beginning to feel that you’re establishing strides forward to have that rug whipped out from under your feet again is just going to damage all that’s been set up in the past and I would really resent that very much.

JD  It’s almost one of the reasons for doing this particular research to try and put over that there is a different point of view.
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JD I'm really trying to find out about how schools that have been inspected by the (local authority) team have found it and what their experiences have been. So perhaps I can start off by asking you how long ago was the inspection of your school?

A In the Autumn - November.

JD So it's still fairly fresh in your memory I would think.

A Yes.

JD Tell me a bit about the preparation that went on. How did the inspectorate prepare you for the inspection? How did you feel about what they did?

A The principal inspector came in and spoke to us as a staff and I think we certainly felt very at ease about that. It was very useful, very informative.

B He gave us the guidelines of what they would be looking at.

A Yes. It was very good from that point of view because we felt that we knew what they would be focussing on and we felt very at ease about it, really.

B We had their brief.

JD Yes.

C It was a two way thing.

B I think from that point of view it was very good because we had the opportunity to ask questions then.

C And there was enough time as well, wasn't there? Not too much, but there again enough to sort of think about it properly.

JD OK. So when you actually came to the inspection itself, how did you find that? What were your reactions?
P I thought it was very positive.
C It was extremely positive.
L They came in with a very positive attitude.
S They did.
L They were very friendly and very out-going. At the same time they weren’t at all intrusive in the classroom, but then we are very used to having people.
P We are.
L Which helped and helped the children.
C Yes. And the fact that they didn’t just sit.
S No. In a corner or perhaps for a little while they did, but then they so quickly joined in in what was going on with the children, which made it much nicer.
JD Yes. So did you feel that what they ended up by saying was valid? Did you feel they saw enough.
P and L Oh yes.(Laughter) Yes, definitely.
JD What’s the laughter?
L I can explain rather well.
S Well very, very nice things, yes. Very nice things.
JD You felt you’d come off really rather well?
Li Yes. Not come off well.
JD You’d come off as you deserved.
C Well we hope so, yes.
S Because you always wonder, will they actually perceive you in that short time as you feel you are, and we felt they really did. They really understood our school and saw what we were doing, what we felt and what our ethos was and that was nice. When we talked to them afterwards, we got feedback.
Li And that was very good afterwards because the principal inspector came again and spoke to us as a whole and we went through, sort of, what they’d written and - well.
L We were all quite surprised at how very good the report was.

P And really, as Sue said, how much they'd picked up in such a short time really.

JD How long were they with you.

P Only three days. Quite a short time, but they had taken it all in.

Li They really had, yes.

P That was nice.

C I think you always expect that they're going to find fault and wrong, don't you? I almost felt they were going to be looking for that although they said they weren't but that was what I felt.

P I think that nagging -

C They did not at all.

P I think that nagging feeling is always at the back of your mind, that you've overlooked something or that there's something that somebody else can see from outside that you can't see yourself and I think that's always the fear.

Li They did say that it would be a celebration of our teaching, didn't they and it really was.

C That was lovely.

JD It's nice to have satisfied customers!

L Well, we all had a chance to talk at the end. We had an interview at the end and personally I found that very thought-provoking. It made me go away and have a good think on a personal level which I found very useful.

JD Did you have a chance before they came into your classrooms to say anything about what you were doing?

Li Well they'd asked us to prepare different pieces. Obviously they'd asked (the head) to prepare quite detailed - um - philosophy, curriculum policy statements and things, quite a - and we prepared in the classroom the sort of week overview. Well actually I think we'd given more than that. We'd given a long term overview, a short term overview and then detailed plans. We had those ready so they could pick them up.

C Things we just normally wrote in our diaries, we wrote on sheets for them.

L We discussed this informally amongst ourselves, how can we best explain to them what
we’re doing, because a lot of it is in your head when you’ve been teaching for a long
time and obviously you need to be able to present what you were just carrying around
in your head. We discussed this informally amongst ourselves and we decided the best
way was to write it out to show this is our thoughts, you know, and these are the details
from the beginning of the week and an overview of how you expect this week to
progress, because we’ve always got our medium term and long term plans all available,
our school project plans and our project plans.

C And I think I have to say from our point of view I think this is one of our strengths
because we are very well planned that way.

Li I mean it was all there.

S We didn’t have to really do anything because inspectors were coming in because was
all there.

P It was always there.

L We really carried on in the same sort of way.

S Oh yes, we didn’t do anything different.

JD Yes.

P We just had everything there to show them. When they said, ‘Well what about this?’ we
said, ‘Here it is. This is what we do.’

S So it was good.

JD Right. What about when - how long after did the written report come?

L It was quite quick.

P It was quite quick. It was before Christmas, wasn’t it?

S It was before Christmas, so we didn’t have to wait very long.

JD And when you got the written report, you felt that was a fair reflection - judging by the
way you were talking.

(Chorus of ‘Yes’)

C Certainly it was very, very positive. Very positive. I couldn’t stress that enough.

S It said what they had said verbally.
P Because you’re always a little anxious about that because until you see it in black and white - it tied up exactly.

JD What has happened since as far as the advisory/inspectorate is concerned.

C We’ve had the link adviser in to (the head) and they had a chat and they detailed three areas, art and music, that they picked up that we were already, I have to say, aware of and taking care of with our development plan. We’d already identified those.

Li And of course, as we’ve updated our three year development plan, we’ve rolled on a year and of course, now we are looking at the areas as the National Curriculum documents have become available, so that was in our programme anyway.

L We felt that they’d picked up the areas that we knew, work we were looking at for the next year, in detail.

P I mean we’re actually into that now because Carol and I are very particularly concerned, but we would have been anyway.

C But we would have been anyway. They were all in our thoughts.

JD What - slightly moving off the inspection to the more general.- What’s been your contact with both the advisory service and the inspectorate? I mean, have you had advisers and advisory teachers into school?

(Chorus of Yes)

JD And how have you found them?

L Very helpful. Yes, very positive.

P I think here we’re in a very unique situation, if you can say ‘very unique’. I think we are in a different situation than a lot of schools, perhaps, because we do have a lot of inspectors calling in because they’re friends of - you know - they’re friends of the school. They park and come in and have a chat, have a cup of coffee, they come in to our open mornings and functions and things we have on and so it’s an on-going dialogue.

S It’s an on-going dialogue and we certainly aren’t in awe of them as they may be in some schools.

C I think it depends on the situation in the school and certainly if you were tucked away in a small village in the middle of nowhere, it would be more unusual to see them, a cause to panic when they arrive.

Li Here we don’t really take any notice. It could be the prime minister.
L  We are very lucky. We have lots of visitors. We’re always very pleased to have them. They’re always very thought provoking.

P  Of course, after the inspection, we did have the visit from someone from the DES.

Li  We did.

L  And we had a visit from (the CEO) as well, last term, didn’t we.

S  We do get a lot of visitors.

JD  You are, you’re getting the high-ups, aren’t you? And of course, it’s partly where you are, I think as well as your being a good school.

P  And I think too, our catchment area makes us an interesting school and so I think they are interested in that area.

JD  Yes, yes.
APPENDIX 6.0

EXAMPLE OF SPLIT HALF CORRELATION

A sample of 10% of replies (13 schools) to headteachers' questionnaire 2 was chosen by taking every 10th school. The totals of the replies for each item were added. These were then arranged in columns and their correlation calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X^2</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>XY</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Y^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1024</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1024</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1156</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>841</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1156</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1024</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1089</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1156</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>841</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>784</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ N = 10 \]

The following formula is then applied:

\[
r = \frac{[N \times C] - (B \times D)}{\sqrt{[N \times A - B^2] \times [N \times E - D^2]}}
\]

\[
r = \frac{[10 \times 10046] - [317 \times 316]}{\sqrt{[10 \times 10095 - 100489] \times [10 \times 10030 - 99856]}}
\]

\[
r = \frac{100460 - 100172}{\sqrt{100950 - 100489} \times [100300 - 99856]}
\]

\[
r = \frac{288}{\sqrt{461 \times 444}}
\]

\[
r = \frac{288}{\sqrt{204684}}
\]

\[
r = 0.637
\]

This is significant at the 5% level