



Centre for Teaching Excellence  
Ionad Sàr-mhathais ann an Teagasg

# Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy

Author(s)

Irene Bell

Stuart Hall

Aileen Kennedy

Kevin Lowden

Kevin Proudfoot



## Centre for Teaching Excellence (CfTE) Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy

### Overview Summary of Strategy Document

- **The CfTE Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy (MES)** outlines how the Centre will monitor and evaluate objectives agreed with the Scottish Government. It sets out the approach, methods and evidence base used to assess progress against these objectives, reflecting both the Centre's aspirations and Scottish Government's expectations for short- and long-term impact.
- To reflect the complex and dynamic work of the Centre, the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy (MES) is an ambitious, responsive, multi-strand, mixed methods approach which involves an interweaving of varied qualitative and quantitative data (see **Data Gathering Tools** on the next page).
- The MES captures what has been achieved to date and identifies what is feasible within the current funding cycle. **The Framework on p5** provides a detailed overview of the MES, showing phased and prioritised operationalisation: **Green** – activities already delivered; **Turquoise** – activities ongoing for the duration of the Centre and **Yellow** – activities to be delivered by the end of the current funding cycle. As a responsive Framework, the MES will be subject to annual formal review and revision, including streamlining or adaptation as appropriate.
- **Key indicators of impact** fall under two main categories: A) Engagement with and uptake of activities and resources; and B) What difference is engagement with CfTE making on practice (including on teachers who do not work directly with the Centre)? Measures are exemplified in **The Framework**.
- The success of such an approach will require cooperation and support from across CfTE Core Work Strands and external partners, deliberately encompassing capturing data from diverse geographical locations. The team envisages supporting individual core work strands in developing appropriate processes and systems for monitoring, evaluation, reporting and review.
- **The Framework links outputs to short-term outcomes and maps evaluation tools to key research questions aligned with the stated objectives.** It indicates successful delivery against Objective 1, in the Initial Engagement Phase.
- **Ethos** - A distinctive feature of CfTE is the **aim to embed the evaluation and monitoring component into the Centre's activities**, working closely with registered teachers to establish an ethos of enquiry and reflexive practice amongst the Centre team and with teachers more widely. This include a purposeful effort to tread lightly, avoid duplication and minimise burden, being conscious of broader professional workload in the sector. This ethos will support the CfTE team to model a culture of professional enquiry whilst also supporting teachers to value and use data and evidence to understand their context, inform their practice and gather appropriate evidence on the impact of their teaching. Our ethos also underpins the ethical considerations and protocols in our research and evaluation work, all of which is scrutinised and approved by the University of Glasgow College of Social Sciences Ethics Committee, inclusive of due safeguards in respect to factors such as data protection, anonymity and voluntary participation where relevant.

## **Success Indicators (Data Gathering Tools)**

These measures are indicated as qualitative (**QUAL**), quantitative (**QUAN**) or mixed-methods (**MM**). Some measures are intended to monitor direct teacher engagement with the Centre, while others also encompass evaluation of CfTE's wider impact and reach. These measures relate directly to impact, while also being expressive of process.

\*Measures prioritised in current funding cycle as CfTE becomes established in the sector.

### **1. Teacher impact (identifying and analysing changes to teacher practice)**

- 1.1 Teacher focus groups/interviews (including Teacher Associates) (**QUAL**)\*
- 1.2 Teacher surveys (**MM**)\*
- 1.3 Teacher panel (a standing panel, distinct from specific periodic focus groups) (**QUAL**)
- 1.4 Teacher Associate reflective diaries/field notes (**QUAL**)
- 1.5 Meta-analysis of teacher inquiry projects (**MM**)
- 1.6 Case studies and meta-analysis of case studies (**MM**)
- 1.7 Formative feedback: e.g., teacher evaluations from CfTE events/activities (**QUAL**)\*
- 1.8 Professional conversations: internal/external; national/international (**QUAL**)\*
- 1.9 Digital analytics, e.g., participation log metrics, Research Brief downloads (**QUAN**)\*
- 1.10 Literature mapping/other secondary data from other education systems (**MM**)\*
- 1.11 Number of teachers attendance at in-person/online events (**QUAN**)\*

### **2. Children and Young People (CYP) Impact**

- 2.1 Early signs of improved student engagement and learning as reported by teachers (**MM**)
- 2.2 CYP and parent/carer engagement forums

### **3. Policy impact**

- 3.1 Advisory Board discussions and minutes from meetings (**QUAL**)\*
- 3.2 LA PL Leads (also potentially via ES and GTCS leads) (**QUAL**)
- 3.3 System level: focus groups/interviews/surveys/documentated changes to policies (**MM**)
- 3.4 Network Analysis (**MM**)\*

### **4. Equality and Inclusion Impact (Teacher Associates and Teacher Participants)**

- 4.1 Demographic data (**QUAN**)\*
- 4.2 Capacity analysis (e.g. range of skills) (**MM**)

### **5. Academic Impact (How does what we do impact on other academics)**

- 5.1 New contacts and collaborations (**QUAL**)\*
- 5.2 Type and number of dissemination events (**QUAN**)\*

### **6. Economic Impact**

- 6.1 Spillover effects (**MM**)
- 6.2 Resource allocation (**QUAN**)

These data gathering tools are then mapped against the Framework below on p5.

**Short Term Metrics for 2025/26 Delivery (extracted from Success Indicators above).**

Category	Measure	Description	Measure Type
<b>1. Teacher Impact</b>	<b>1.1</b>	Teacher focus groups/interviews (including Teacher Associates)	Qual
	<b>1.2</b>	Teacher surveys	MM
	<b>1.7</b>	Formative feedback: teacher evaluations from CfTE events/activities	Qual
	<b>1.8</b>	Professional conversations: internal/external; national/international	Qual
	<b>1.9</b>	Digital analytics, e.g., participation log metrics, Research Brief downloads	Quan
	<b>1.10</b>	Literature mapping/other secondary data from other education systems	MM
	<b>1.11</b>	Number of teachers attending in-person/online events	Quan
<b>3. Policy Impact</b>	<b>3.1</b>	Advisory Board discussions and minutes	Qual
	<b>3.4</b>	Network Analysis	MM
<b>4. Equality &amp; Inclusion Impact</b>	<b>4.1</b>	Demographic data	Quan
<b>5. Academic Impact</b>	<b>5.1</b>	New contacts and collaborations	Qual
	<b>5.2</b>	Type and number of dissemination events	Quan

## Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy Framework

Already delivered

Delivered by end of current funding cycle (end March 2026)

Ongoing for duration of CfTE

SG Objective*	Research Questions	Success Indicators	Outputs	Shorter Term Outcomes
<b>1. Working in collaboration with teachers and other stakeholders to identify areas of priority for research on learning, teaching, and assessment in Scotland's education system.</b>	1.a What did the initial engagement phase tell us? 1.b What were the limitations of this phase? 1.c How were the emerging priorities reflected in the design of the Centre? 1.d What other triangulative measures have been applied to the survey findings? 1.e How authentic and equitable was the collaborative approach to this objective; whose voices were heard? 1.f Revisit priorities themes as Centre develops over time	<b>1.a:</b> 1.1, 1.2, 1.8, 3.1  <b>1.b:</b> 1.1, 1.2, 1.8, 3.1  <b>1.c:</b> 1.1, 1.2, 1.8,3.1  <b>1.d:</b> 3.1  <b>1.e:</b> 3.1  <b>1.f:</b> 1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design and delivery of 19 focus groups (FGs)</li> <li>• Design, development and circulation of National Teachers' Survey</li> <li>• Initial Engagement Phase Technical Report</li> <li>• Identified priorities to inform and shape decisions about Thematic Hubs</li> <li>• Survey data available open access</li> </ul>	<b>(Baseline)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Priorities for research on learning, teaching, and assessment to be determined as CfTE is established.</b></li> </ul> <b>(Outcomes)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive evidence base created – Data from focus groups and surveys collected and analysed, resulting in a clear, shared list of priority areas for research in learning, teaching, and assessment for the Centre and new Thematic Hubs</li> <li>• Teachers and other stakeholders have expressed their appreciation at being consulted and valued in the design of the new Centre.</li> </ul>

<p><b>2. Gathering national and international evidence about pedagogy and practice, providing analysis and synthesis of that evidence, ensuring this is widely accessible and relevant in a range of different contexts.</b></p>	<p>2.a How do we capitalise on existing research in the Scottish education system in collaboration with other national agencies?  2.b To what extent are the research syntheses from CfTE reaching teachers, deemed to be accessible and relevant to teachers?  2.c. Which existing research on each hub theme proves most useful to Scotland's teachers? How? Why?  2.d What gaps are there in the current evidence available?  2.e To what extent do the various hubs perceive their specific contextual needs to be met in terms of the available research?  2.f To what extent does the available evidence reflect decolonial perspectives?</p>	<p><b>2.a:</b> 1.8, 1.10, 3.1, 3.2   <b>2.b:</b> 1.3,1.7,1.8.1.9   <b>2.c:</b> 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.7   <b>2d:</b> 1.3, 1.10   <b>2.e:</b> 1.1,1.2,1.10   <b>2.f:</b> 1.8,1.10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core hub research and dissemination plans</li> <li>• Thematic hub research and dissemination plans</li> <li>• Ongoing production of pedagogy and practice research evidence and synthesis reports</li> <li>• Dissemination of research evidence and synthesis reports through: CfTE website/social media, digital briefs/podcasts.</li> </ul>	<p><b>(Baseline)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>National and international research evidence is not accessible, relevant and widely used (prior to the Centre's inception).</b></li> </ul> <p><b>(Outcomes)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers incorporate insights from the Centre's pedagogy and practice resources into their own teaching practice.</li> <li>• Improved accessibility and uptake of national and international evidence across diverse educational contexts</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Establishing partnerships with educational stakeholders including local authorities, schools, universities, and national bodies to</b></p>	<p>3.a Who is CfTE partnering with (mapping)?  3.b What's the nature (power dynamics)/quality of the partnership relationship? Where, why, to what end?  3.c On what basis are decisions made about who CfTE should partner with?  3.d Who is not represented/under-represented in CfTE partnerships?</p>	<p><b>3a:</b> 1.3, 1.8, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 5.1  <b>3b:</b> 1.1, 1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4   <b>3c:</b> 3.1, 3.2   <b>3d:</b> 3.4, 4.1   <b>3e:</b> 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 6.1, 6.2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholder Engagement Plan authored and approved</li> <li>• Establishment of a Partnership Forum (cross institutional, cross sector and transnational)</li> <li>• Partnership agreements in place</li> <li>• Partnership mapping analysis/report.</li> </ul>	<p><b>(Baseline)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>As a new component in the Scottish education system, partnerships are to be established.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>(Outcomes)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Active partnerships established with local authorities, schools, cross university/universities and</li> </ul>

<p><b>enable the development of professionally relevant research-practice collaborations.</b></p>	<p>3.e What are the outcomes of these partnerships in terms of uptake across local authorities?  3.f How are we defining research-practice collaborations at range of different levels?  3.g (How) are partners evaluating the impact of these collaborations?/How do partners perceive the impact of these collaborations?</p>	<p><b>3f:</b> 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 3.2, 3.3   <b>3g:</b> 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 5.2</p>		<p>national bodies to develop research-practice collaborations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased system-wide commitment to, and engagement in, research-practice collaborations with the Centre</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Supporting practice-focused research, for example practitioner enquiry, on teaching, learning and assessment, in relation to those areas of priority.</b></p>	<p>4.a How is practice-focused research being conceptualised and facilitated across CfTE (including the various hubs, both in person and digitally) and how does this align with international research about practice-focused research?  4.b What does the practice-focused research look like regarding methods adopted?  4.c What have teachers focused on in their practice-focused research?  4.d What impact has this research made locally and beyond?  4.e Who have teachers worked with in carrying out their practice-focused research?  4.f How well supported do teachers feel they are (in relation to practice-focused research)?  4.g What can a meta-analysis of individual practitioner enquiry outputs</p>	<p><b>4a:</b> 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9, 1.11, 2.1, 3.2, 3.3   <b>4b:</b> 1.8, 1.10   <b>4c:</b> 1.4, 1.5, 1.6   <b>4d:</b> 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 3.2, 5.1, 6.1, 6.2  <b>4e:</b> 1.4, 1.5, 1.6   <b>4f:</b> 1.7, 1.8, 3.2, 4.2   <b>4g:</b> 1.5, 1.6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hubs structure design</li> <li>• Hubs launched.</li> <li>• Professional learning opportunities developed and launched through digital and physical hubs, agreed with local and regional partners</li> <li>• Relevant LA discussions ongoing regarding feasibility of studying economic measures relating to spend on PL</li> </ul>	<p><b>(Baseline)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Prior to CfTE’s establishment, an absence of evidence of pathways and support mechanisms for teachers undertaking practice focused research.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>(Outcomes)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers and schools engage in practice-focused research supported by the Centre.</li> <li>• CfTE pathways and support mechanisms for teachers undertaking practice focused research are developed and used.</li> <li>• Professional learning opportunities provided by CfTE to strengthen teacher capacity in practice-focused research.</li> </ul>

	<p>reveal, including numbers undertaken, geographical distribution and reported impact?</p> <p>4.h What role have the TAs played in supporting teachers' practice-focused research?</p> <p>4. i Who is not accessing support from CfTE for practice-focused research, and why?</p>	<p><b>4h:</b> 1.1,1.4, 1.6, 1.8</p> <p><b>4i:</b> 1.2, 1.7, 3.2, 3.3</p>		
<p><b>5. Sharing research evidence and experiences to support teachers to develop their own practice.</b></p>	<p>5.a How and where is the practice-focused research being mobilised within the system?</p> <p>5.b How are the research syntheses being mobilised within the system?</p> <p>5.c In what ways is research and evidence produced for sharing (e.g. research briefings, podcasts....)?</p> <p>5.d To what extent does CfTE support and develop teachers' research literacy?</p>	<p><b>5a:</b> 1.5, 1.6, 3.2, 5.1, 5.2</p> <p><b>5b:</b> 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 5.2</p> <p><b>5c:</b> 1.8, 1.9</p> <p><b>5d:</b> 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hub research evidence and synthesis reports disseminated, as in objective 2.</li> <li>• Hub Lead and Teacher Associates (TA) to coordinate a series of online and in-person opportunities through regionally based hubs for teachers to share their research/enquiry.</li> <li>• Schedule of online and in-person sessions published.</li> <li>• Expert sessions and panel discussions</li> </ul>	<p><b>(Baseline)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Practice-focused research is not yet mobilised and shared with teachers systematically, prior to CfTE's inception.</li> </ul> <p><b>(Outcomes)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers access and apply research evidence shared by the Centre to improve classroom practice</li> <li>• Increased opportunities for teachers to share research findings and experiences both in-person and online.</li> <li>• Early signs of improved engagement and learning among children and young people as self-reported by teachers.</li> </ul>

\*Although there are five SG objectives, they do not stand alone; we recognise the significant degree of cross-over.



## **Context of the MES**

The Centre for Teaching Excellence has been funded in the first instance for the period January 2025 – end March 2026. Work to date has concentrated on the set up of the Centre, including an ‘initial engagement phase’ designed to meet Scottish Government priority 1: ‘to work collaboratively with educators and stakeholders to identify priority areas for research in learning, teaching, and assessment. The results of that work are reported in Bell et al. (2025).

Following on from that initial work, this monitoring and evaluation strategy outlines how all five Scottish Government objectives can be monitored and evaluated. In developing this strategy, we acknowledge that while some elements of the Centre’s development and early operation can be monitored relatively straightforwardly, evaluating and understanding its impact on young people’s experiences and achievements is a much more complex and longer-term endeavour. The Framework scopes out the monitoring and evaluation work that can usefully and feasibly be carried out within the term of this initial funding period.

## **Explanatory Notes on Developing the CfTE Evaluation Strategy**

### ***CfTE Aims***

The overarching aim of CfTE is to support all teachers in Scotland to help meet the Scottish Government’s (SG) aim of improving outcomes for children and young people through enhancing research-informed and enquiry-based teaching in schools. In summary, the Centre’s aim is *‘to support teachers, including those in Gaelic Medium Education, to actively lead and engage with research and evidence to help inform and develop their practice’*.

### ***CfTE Objectives:***

1. Work in collaboration with teachers and other stakeholders to identify areas of priority for research on learning, teaching and assessment in Scotland’s education system
2. Support practice-focused research, for example practitioner enquiry, on teaching, learning and assessment, in relation to those areas of priority;
3. Gather national and international evidence about pedagogy and practice, providing analysis and synthesis of that evidence, ensuring this is widely accessible and relevant in a range of different contexts;
4. Share research evidence and experiences to support teachers to develop their own practice;
5. Establish partnerships with educational stakeholders including local authorities, schools, universities and national bodies to enable the development of professionally relevant research-practice collaborations.



## ***CfTE Core Work Strands***

### **Centre Management and Governance**

CfTE is led and managed by a Director, a Deputy Director and a Centre Manager, supported by professional services, finance and communications colleagues. The governance structure includes both internal and external boards and groups and this structure will evolve as the Hubs become fully operational. **Governance is overseen by (i) the UoG internal CfTE Steering Group (ii) the Scottish Government /CfTE Group which meets monthly. Sector stakeholders also offer guidance and insight through the Advisory Board.**

### **Digital Development and Innovation**

The aim of this work strand is to design, develop, and sustain a high-quality digital infrastructure that enables accessible, interactive, and research-informed professional learning for teachers across Scotland. Digital development and innovation underpin the development and roll-out of the Core and Thematic Hubs and provides an infrastructure for wider engagement with CfTE. The digital development and innovation work strand can be split into outward-facing website aspects and teacher platform (i.e., Moodle).

### **Professional Learning Hubs**

Three Core Hubs have been established, as follows:

***Teaching-Focused Research and Strategic Hub Development:*** To develop, support, and facilitate research-focused activities, informed by existing international research and practice, to guide the research activities of all hubs, including but not limited to practitioner enquiry, communities of practice, and research-practice partnerships.

***Rural Education and Learning for Sustainability (LfS):*** To provide research-informed support and activities for teachers working across rural and island areas of Scotland and for teachers with an interest in developing LfS across all areas of Scotland.

***Gaelic Education:*** To support and enhance Gaelic Education by ensuring access to high-quality, research-informed professional learning, fostering collaboration among Gaelic educators, and advocating for the sustainability and growth of Gaelic education across Scotland.

### **Thematic Hubs**

Three further Thematic Hubs have been established:

**Pedagogy to support attainment in diverse classrooms** - University of Aberdeen

**Innovation in pedagogy to enhance classroom practice** - University of Strathclyde

## **Digital education and Artificial Intelligence (AI) in advancing pedagogy** - University of Edinburgh

These foci of which have been identified through considering: evidence from the CfTE initial engagement phase (Bell et al., 2025); advice from the CfTE Advisory Board and key themes from recent reports across the system. Each hub has a lead from one of the teacher education universities in Scotland and a number of Teacher Associates seconded on a part-time basis from Scottish schools.

### **Research and Evaluation**

The Research and Evaluation team (see p.14) designs, in collaboration with the wider CfTE team, the monitoring and evaluation strategy and carries out the associated data collection, analysis and reporting. It is closely linked with the University of Glasgow's Centre for Transformative Change in Schools (CenTCS), ensuring that any related externally funded research projects undertaken by CenTCS members are able to feed into the research and development work of CfTE. The team will also work closely with the two PhD students appointed to University of Glasgow funded scholarships associated with the CfTE bid and supervised through CenTCS. The studentships focus on:

- How teachers' engagement in research activities develops their knowledge and shapes their pedagogical decisions
- Accounting for teacher professional learning at scale

Together, these core work strands bring life to the Centre, and their contributions will be considered within the monitoring and evaluation strategy. However, evaluating the impact of any professional learning is an extremely complex task, and not without difficulty. Any attempt to 'draw a line of sight' between Centre activities, impact on teachers' pedagogical knowledge and practice and outcomes for children and young people, presents notable methodological and practical challenges. Our preliminary work has therefore focused on an appropriate and robust evaluation framework, initially though identifying research questions to address the five Scottish Government objectives outlined in the Framework. As the Centre develops, we will adopt an iterative approach, ensuring adaptability and flexibility as evaluation activity progresses.

### **Methodology**

We will use quantitative and qualitative approaches to gather relevant data and evidence to address the research questions outlined against each objective listed in the Framework. This will include gathering primary and secondary data from a range of sources within and outwith CfTE as a form of triangulation to overcome the potential weaknesses in a single methods study. The focus in this initial phase of funding is on formative and summative short-term metrics. However, we anticipate that these will help to establish baselines for longer-term evaluation.

For each of the five Scottish Government objectives we have identified a series of research questions and the Framework maps these research questions against likely sources of evidence.

The success of such an approach will require cooperation and support across all CfTE strands and teams. This will initially be through sharing their strategies and plans with the Research and Evaluation Team. In turn, the team envisages supporting teams working on individual strands / hubs, as well as cross cutting themes, in developing appropriate processes and systems for monitoring, evaluation, reporting and review.

In addition, the Teacher Associates will be pivotal to the evaluation process and the Research and Evaluation Team will support them in gathering relevant evidence for the Hubs.

We believe that adopting a unified approach to evaluation across the various strands of CfTE activity will provide cohesion and consistency in evaluation activity.

**Advice and guidance on the successful approach of the methodology will be offered by external partners through the Advisory Board mechanism. Governance of the methodology is ultimately overseen by (i) the UoG internal CFTE Steering Group (ii) the Scottish Government /CfTE Group which meets monthly.**

### ***Ethos***

A distinctive feature of CfTE is the aim to embed the evaluation and monitoring component into the Centre's activities and establish an ethos of enquiry and reflexive practice amongst the Centre team and with teachers more widely. This could take a variety of forms such as Research and Evaluation Team members collaborating with the Teaching-Focused Research Core Hub to support practitioner enquiries and then to synthesise the outcomes of these enquiries across the CfTE. The Centre team has in place processes to support its own reflection, review and development, for example, through feedback from the internal Steering Group, whole team reflection at regular review and development days and feedback from the CfTE Advisory Board.

This reflexive ethos underpins the ethical considerations and protocols in our research and evaluation work, all of which is/will be scrutinised and approved by the University of Glasgow College of Social Sciences Ethics Committee. Commitment to this ethos will support the CfTE team to model a culture of professional enquiry whilst also supporting teachers to value and use data and evidence to understand their context, inform their practice and gather appropriate evidence on the impact of their teaching.

## **Key indicators of impact**

Key indicators of impact fall under two main categories:

### **A. Engagement with and uptake of activities and resources**

Examples of measures here include: numbers of attendees at CfTE hub events; number of downloads of Research Briefs; Centre social media follower numbers & engagement metrics



B. What difference is engagement with CfTE making on practice?

Examples of measures here include: teacher accounts of applying learning from CfTE activities in practice; meta-analysis of practitioner enquiries across Hubs; resurveying teachers to identify any changes in reported engagement in professional learning attributed to the Centre; mapping the ways in which CfTE engages with partners, using Network Analysis.

## **CfTE Research and Evaluation Team members**

**Professor Aileen Kennedy**, CfTE Research and Evaluation Lead and Joint Director of the Centre of Transformative Change in Schools

**Irene Bell**, CfTE Evaluation Programme Manager

**Stuart Hall**, Research Officer and Fellow of the Centre of Transformative Change in Schools

**Kevin Lowden**, Research Officer and Fellow of the Centre of Transformative Change in Schools

**Dr Kevin Proudfoot**, Senior Lecturer and Fellow of the Centre of Transformative Change in Schools