



NFER Teacher Voice Omnibus November 2009 Survey

Continuing Professional Development Training and Development Agency for Schools

This report was written by: Gill Featherstone and Katie Pyle

Please direct all questions about this report to Katie Pyle, Project Manager of the Omnibus at the NFER (k.pyle@nfer.ac.uk).

December 2009

Contents

Introduction	1
Context	1
Analysis of findings	2
The sample	2
Usage of the professional standards for teachers	3
CPD in relation to school policy and performance	4
Monitoring and evaluation of CPD	5
CPD methods and involvement of staff	7
CPD undertaken	7
Involvement of staff	11
Conclusions and implications for the client	12
Supporting information	13
How was the survey conducted?	13
What was the composition of the panel?	13
How representative of schools nationally were the schools corresponding to the teachers panel?	13
How accurately do the findings represent the national position?	17

Introduction

Six questions were submitted by the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA) to NFER's Teacher Voice Omnibus Survey in November 2009. The questions covered the following topics:

- whether teachers use the professional standards for identifying continuing professional development (CPD) needs and performance management
- the extent to which teachers feel that CPD is linked to performance management and their School Improvement Plan.
- whether or not CPD is evaluated for impact, and the evaluation methods used
- how useful teachers have found various modes of CPD
- the extent to which all staff are involved in CPD.

This report provides an analysis of the responses to the questions, along with supporting information about the survey. Similar questions were asked in previous Omnibus surveys, in February and June 2009, and time-based comparisons are made where these are useful. Results from the latest survey are presented by school phase (primary and secondary) and by teacher seniority level (classroom teachers or senior leaders). This report forms one part of the output from the Omnibus survey. The analysis is also presented and given in more detail on a set of interactive web-based tables produced separately (in Pulsar Web).

Context

The TDA aims to promote high-quality training and CPD for the school workforce, with the aim of enhancing outcomes for learners¹. Part of this is to ensure, as the TDA outlines in its strategic plan for 2008-13² that teachers have training opportunities which meet their needs and result in well-defined outcomes. As noted in previous Omnibus reports, the TDA introduced a new set of revised professional standards for teachers in 2007³. These provide a clear framework of the skills, knowledge and attributes that teachers need to perform their role effectively at all stages of their teaching career. The

¹ Training and Development Agency for Schools (2009). Our Role [online]. Available: <http://www.tda.gov.uk/about/role.aspx> [09 December 2009]

² Training and Development Agency for Schools (2008). *Strategic Plan 2008-13*. London: TDA [online]. Available: http://www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/pdf/s/strategic_plan_08.pdf [09 December 2009].

³ Training and Development Agency for Schools (2007). *Professional Standards for Teachers. Why Sit Still in Your Career?* London: TDA [online]. Available: http://www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/pdf/s/standards_a4.pdf [09 December 2009].

standards form a back-drop to the new performance management arrangements which were implemented in schools in Autumn 2007 to enable the more effective review of teachers' performance and development needs. The standards are intended to be used as a reference point during the performance management process. Schools are also expected to link performance management to their school improvement plans, integrating staff development with the development of the school as a whole⁴.

The revised professional standards should form an integral part of career planning and the identification of CPD needs. The standards also have implications for teachers' career progression and pay, as teachers will need to be able to demonstrate how they meet the standards in order to progress. On this basis, it is very important that teachers are both aware of the standards and are using them to plan their future careers and CPD needs. Research conducted by NFER on behalf of the TDA in October 2008 suggested that while some teachers were using the professional standards as a reference point for career planning, identifying CPD needs and performance management, use was not yet universal. Further, one in ten classroom teachers appeared to be unaware of the standards.

In this context it was useful, in this round of the Teacher Voice survey, to seek information about whether teachers use or are planning to use the professional standards for performance management, career planning and identifying CPD needs. Teachers were also asked about the extent to which CPD in their school is linked to individual teachers' needs, the school's improvement plan and whether it is evaluated to assess its impact. Further, teachers were asked how important CPD is to them when considering their future careers.

Analysis of findings

The sample

The survey was completed by a sample of over 1,300 teachers and the sample was weighted to ensure representativeness. The sample included teachers from a wide range of school governance types and subject areas. Sample numbers were sufficient to allow for comparisons between the primary and secondary sectors and between senior leaders and teachers. Detailed information about the sample is given in the supplementary section at the end of this report.

⁴ Training and Development Agency for Schools (2007). Model Performance Management Policy for Schools [online]. Available: http://www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/pdf/p/pm_modelpolicy_mar07.pdf [09 December 2009]

Usage of the professional standards for teachers

The first question submitted to the Teacher Voice survey asked respondents to specify whether or not they had used the new professional standards for teachers (introduced in 2007 by the TDA) for different purposes. The data in Table 1 below shows that:

- Around three-quarters (74 per cent) of all respondents reported that they had used the standards **in relation to performance management**. This was a similar proportion to those responding in this way in previous surveys.
- Around two-fifths (41 per cent) of all teachers had used the standards **in order to identify CPD needs**. Following a decline in the use of the professional standards for this purpose in the previous survey (of June 2009), this marks a slight enhancement in their use back towards previous levels (36 per cent used them in this way in June 2009, compared to 58 per cent in February 2009).
- Senior leaders were more likely than classroom teachers to report that they had used the professional standards. This reflects findings in earlier omnibus surveys and, as discussed in previous reports, may be due to the strategic focus of senior leadership positions, or indeed their reluctance to give a less ‘desirable’ response.

Further analysis of the data also revealed that primary school respondents were slightly less likely than their counterparts in secondary schools to report that they had used the standards at all (16 per cent compared to 22 per cent). Previous surveys showed relatively little difference between the extent to which primary and secondary schools reported using the standards. However, it would seem that secondary schools may have slightly increased their usage of the standards overall.

Table 1. Have you used the new professional standards for teachers that were introduced in June 2007 for any of the following?

	All	Primary	Secondary
Performance management	74%	72%	76%
Identifying CPD needs	41%	38%	45%
Other	11%	10%	12%
I have not used the standards	19%	22%	16%
Local base (N)	1341	687	651

*Respondents were able to select more than one response so percentages may sum to more than 100
 Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total
 Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2009*

CPD in relation to school policy and performance

Teachers were next asked about the extent to which CPD was linked to areas of school policy and performance. As Table 2 shows, just under half of all respondents (46 per cent) felt that CPD was linked to performance management ‘a great deal’, while 38 per cent said that these linked ‘a fair amount’. Therefore, more than eight in ten teachers were positive that a link existed.

Table 2. To what extent is CPD in your school linked to performance management?

	All	Primary	Secondary
A great deal	46%	45%	47%
A fair amount	38%	38%	39%
Not very much	11%	11%	10%
Not at all	2%	2%	2%
Don’t know	3%	3%	3%
Local base (N)	1339	685	651

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2009

Teachers were also relatively positive about the extent to which CPD was linked to their school’s improvement plan; 48 per cent of all respondents felt it was linked ‘a great deal’ and 36 per cent reported that it linked ‘a fair amount’ (see Table 3 below).

Table 3. To what extent is CPD in your school linked to the school's improvement plan?

	All	Primary	Secondary
A great deal	48%	50%	46%
A fair amount	36%	35%	38%
Not very much	9%	9%	9%
Not at all	2%	2%	1%
Don’t know	5%	5%	6%
Local base (N)	1325	679	641

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2009

There was little variance between the responses of those teaching in secondary and those teaching in primary schools to both questions. However, there were again some contrasts of response in relation to seniority: senior leaders were more positive about the extent to which CPD is linked to performance and the school improvement plan (around 95 to 96 per cent felt it was linked a ‘great deal’ or a ‘fair amount’ to either, compared to 82 per cent of classroom teachers).

Monitoring and evaluation of CPD

Teachers were next asked about the extent to which CPD was evaluated for impact in their school. Responses showed that very little had changed since the previous survey of June 2009. This confirms, as suggested in previous reports, that more still needs to be done to encourage the monitoring and evaluation of CPD.

Overall, just under half of all respondents reported that their school evaluated CPD ‘a fair amount’ (47 per cent of all teachers) and just under a fifth of teachers considered that CPD was evaluated ‘a great deal’ (18 per cent). However, a quarter of teachers (25 per cent) felt that ‘not very much’ evaluation of CPD was undertaken within their institution, while a further seven per cent did not know (see Table 4 below).

Table 4. To what extent is CPD in your school evaluated for impact?

	All	Primary	Secondary
A great deal	18%	18%	18%
A fair amount	47%	48%	46%
Not very much	25%	24%	27%
Not at all	3%	4%	3%
Don't know	7%	7%	7%
Local base (N)	1344	688	652

*Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100
 Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total
 Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2009*

It is not surprising that senior leaders, who would tend to have strategic roles, were more positive about the extent of CPD evaluation that took place in their school (with 85 per cent considering it to have taken place ‘a fair amount’ or ‘a great deal’, in contrast with 61 per cent of classroom teachers). Further analysis of the data showed that there was little difference in the extent of CPD evaluation undertaken across primary and secondary school sectors.

In terms of the methods used to evaluate the impact of CPD, teachers were most likely to report that their school used performance management processes/appraisal interviews (66 per cent) or verbal feedback (63 per cent).

The responses presented in Table 5 below show some interesting differences between the methods used for the evaluation of CPD in primary and secondary schools. Primary schools (as also reported in the June 2009 report) were more likely to use verbal or face-to-face methods, while secondary schools reported using more paper-based processes. This finding may reflect the practicalities of communication between staff in larger or smaller institutions.

Primary schools were more likely to be using the performance management process/appraisal interview and school development plan to evaluate CPD than secondary schools. However, it should be remembered that secondary school teachers were just as positive about the links between CPD and school policy and performance and also the extent to which their school evaluated CPD (as reported above).

The pattern of responses given by senior leaders reflected those of other staff (within each school sector), although leaders were again more positive about the extent to which each method was used overall.

Table 5. Which of the following is used to evaluate the impact of CPD in your school?

	All	Primary	Secondary
Paper questionnaire/evaluation form	49%	37%	62%
Online questionnaire/evaluation form	10%	4%	16%
Verbal feedback	63%	73%	52%
Review or follow-up meeting	40%	47%	30%
Performance management process/appraisal interview	66%	70%	61%
School development plan	41%	46%	35%
Other	1%	1%	1%
Local base (N)	1303	664	634

*Respondents were able to select more than one response so percentages may sum to more than 100
 Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total
 Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2009*

CPD methods and involvement of staff

CPD undertaken

The next series of questions focused on different forms of CPD, whether or not they had been undertaken by staff, and how useful they were found to be.

Tables 6 to 12 below display the data for each type or form of CPD. In considering these tables, it is worth emphasising that the proportion of those who were able to comment on the usefulness of each approach was related to the proportion who had experienced it.

In summary, survey respondents were most likely to have undertaken CPD in the form of ‘courses’ (84 per cent) and ‘working collaboratively with others’ (83 per cent). Around half had ‘observed a colleague’ (53 per cent), while 52 per cent had made use of ‘colleague mentoring/coaching’. Respondents were less likely to report that they had accessed ‘online study’ (22 per cent), and only 10 per cent had completed ‘Masters level study’. This would seem to reflect a preference for, or ability to better access, more “collegiate” forms of support, and, again, closely reflects the findings presented in the June report.

Overall, the vast majority of respondents were likely to report that they had found each method of CPD ‘quite’ or ‘very useful’, and were slightly more likely to consider each mode of CPD as ‘very useful’ than ‘slightly useful’ (with the exception of online study, which may go some way to explaining the low usage rates of this particular method of CPD).

Table 6. How useful to your development was coaching and/or mentoring by a colleague?

	All	Primary	Secondary
Not at all useful	1%	<1%	1%
Not very useful	3%	3%	3%
Unsure	1%	1%	2%
Quite useful	21%	19%	24%
Very useful	25%	27%	23%
Have not undertaken	48%	49%	47%
Local base (N)	1300	665	630

*Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100
 Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total
 Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2009*

Table 7. How useful to your development was attending courses?

	All	Primary	Secondary
Not at all useful	<1%	<1%	<1%
Not very useful	3%	3%	2%
Unsure	1%	2%	1%
Quite useful	37%	39%	34%
Very useful	43%	46%	38%
Have not undertaken	16%	10%	24%
Local base (N)	1331	684	642

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2009

Table 8. How useful to your development was observing a colleague?

	All	Primary	Secondary
Not at all useful	<1%	<1%	<1%
Not very useful	2%	1%	2%
Unsure	1%	1%	1%
Quite useful	25%	19%	29%
Very useful	26%	24%	28%
Have not undertaken	47%	55%	39%
Local base (N)	1307	665	636

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2009

Table 9. How useful to your development was working collaboratively with others?

	All	Primary	Secondary
Not at all useful	1%	<1%	1%
Not very useful	1%	1%	1%
Unsure	2%	2%	2%
Quite useful	30%	27%	35%
Very useful	49%	53%	44%
Have not undertaken	17%	17%	18%
Local base (N)	1324	679	641

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2009

Table 10. How useful to your development was Masters level study?

	All	Primary	Secondary
Not at all useful	1%	1%	1%
Not very useful	1%	1%	2%
Unsure	<1%	<1%	1%
Quite useful	3%	3%	3%
Very useful	6%	6%	5%
Have not undertaken	90%	90%	89%
Local base (N)	1283	655	624

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2009

Table 11. How useful to your development was online study?

	All	Primary	Secondary
Not at all useful	1%	1%	1%
Not very useful	3%	3%	2%
Unsure	1%	<1%	2%
Quite useful	11%	11%	10%
Very useful	7%	8%	6%
Have not undertaken	78%	77%	80%
Local base (N)	1286	658	622

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2009

Table 12. How useful to your development was any ‘other’ form of CPD?

	All	Primary	Secondary
Not at all useful	1%	1%	<1%
Not very useful	<1%	<1%	0%
Unsure	1%	1%	1%
Quite useful	3%	3%	4%
Very useful	6%	6%	6%
Have not undertaken	89%	89%	89%
Local base (N)	794	408	379

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2009

When the data was analysed in relation to school phase, there were two main differences between the types of CPD accessed by secondary school teachers and those teaching in primary schools. These can be summarised as follows:

- 24 per cent of secondary school teachers had not undertaken ‘courses’ compared to 10 per cent of primary school teachers
- 55 per cent of primary school teachers had not ‘observed a colleague’, compared to 39 per cent in secondary school.

These patterns by school sector were evident for both senior leaders and classroom teachers. The CPD methods more likely to be accessed by school phase may reflect the size and organisation of the institutions: with, for example, secondary schools teachers inevitably able to access internal CPD from a greater institutional pool of skilled professionals. Primary school teachers and leaders, are perhaps more reliant on accessing CPD externally in the form of courses and online study.

It was apparent that school leaders were more likely than classroom teachers to have undertaken each method of CPD. This finding is perhaps unsurprising given the length of time a senior leader is likely to have been in the profession. The exception to this was 'Masters level study' where a similar proportion of senior leaders to classroom teachers overall had not undertaken this type of CPD.

When asked to specify any additional CPD that had been undertaken, 89 per cent of all respondents reported that they had not undertaken any additional CPD to the options given, and, of those that had, the training had mainly been in relation to increasing their leadership skills, reflecting the importance of this area for professional development. Although the majority reporting this kind of additional CPD were school leaders, there were also a number of classroom teachers who had taken part in middle management CPD and accessed training on delivering CPD themselves.

Involvement of staff

Respondents were also asked about the extent to which CPD in their school involved all staff. The response was fairly positive, with 46 per cent reporting 'fair amount', and 37 per cent 'a great deal' of staff in involvement (see Table 13 below). Again, senior leaders were more positive than classroom teachers about the extent of this involvement. However, 12 per cent of all respondents felt that there was 'not very much' staff involvement. These results reflect findings in the previous survey.

Table 13. To what extent does CPD in your school involve the whole staff?

	All	Primary	Secondary
A great deal	37%	36%	40%
A fair amount	46%	48%	44%
Not very much	12%	12%	12%
Not at all	1%	2%	1%
Don't know	3%	3%	3%
Local base (N)	1345	690	650

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2009

Conclusions and implications for the client

On the whole, the results from the November 2009 survey show that teachers' use of the professional standards has remained fairly static since the previous Teacher Omnibus Survey in June 2009. While three-quarters of teaching staff are using the standards in relation to performance management, their use in identifying CPD needs is still less widespread. However, teachers were positive overall about the extent to which CPD was linked to both performance management and to the school improvement plan, suggesting that the professional standards do have an impact on CPD in the long-run and that school leaders, are taking a strategic approach to CPD. One area for improvement may be the evaluation of CPD: although many schools do carry out evaluation and use a range of methods to do this, responses suggested around a quarter of schools do not carry out much evaluation of CPD activities.

In terms of types and forms of CPD methods, the most popular formats are of the face-to-face variety, including attending courses and working collaboratively. Those methods that are (arguably) more 'distant', such as Masters level study or online training, continue to be less popular. The survey findings showed a persisting difference between the types of CPD accessed by primary and secondary school staff, though these might be at least partially explained in terms of accessibility and institutional and local contexts.

Supporting information

How was the survey conducted?

This report is based on data from the November 2009 survey. The survey was completed in November 2009 by a panel of 1,378 practising teachers from 911 schools in the maintained sector in England. The survey was conducted online and teachers were asked to complete the questionnaire between 6 November and 18 November 2009. During the survey period all ‘open’ questions (those without a pre-identified set of responses) were coded by a team of experienced coders within the Foundation.

What was the composition of the panel?

The panel included teachers from the full range of roles in primary and secondary schools, from headteachers to newly qualified class teachers. Fifty per cent (692) of the respondents were teaching in primary schools and 50 per cent (686) were teaching in secondary schools.

How representative of schools nationally were the schools corresponding to the teachers panel?

There was an under-representation of schools in the highest quintile in terms of eligibility for free school meals in both the sample of primary schools and the sample of secondary schools. The sample of secondary schools also had an over-representation of schools with low eligibility for free school meals. To address this, weights were calculated using free schools meals factors to create a more balanced sample. Due to the differences between the populations of primary schools and secondary schools, different weights were created for primary schools, secondary schools and then for the whole sample overall. The weightings have been applied to all of the analyses referred to in this commentary and contained within the tables supplied in electronic format (via Pulsar Web)⁵.

Tables S.1, S.2 and S.3 show the representation of the weighted achieved sample against the population. Table S.4 shows the representation of the weighted teacher sample by role in school.

⁵ *The sample was not weighted for missing free school meal data*

Table S.1 Representation of (weighted) primary schools compared to primary schools nationally

		National Population	NFER Sample
		%	%
Achievement Band (Overall performance by KS2 2008 data)	Lowest band	16	18
	2nd lowest band	17	19
	Middle band	18	18
	2nd highest band	20	21
	Highest band	22	23
	Missing	7	1
% eligible FSM	Lowest 20%	20	20
	2nd lowest 20%	20	20
	Middle 20%	20	20
	2nd highest 20%	20	20
	Highest 20%	20	20
	Missing	1	0
Primary school type	Infant/First	15	8
	Primary/Combined	77	74
	Junior	8	16
	Middle/other type	<1	1
Region	North	31	24
	Midlands	32	30
	South	37	46
Local Authority type	London Borough	11	11
	Metropolitan Authorities	21	17
	English Unitary Authorities	18	20
	Counties	51	52
Number of schools		17019	573

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Some information is not available for all schools and some schools included more than one respondent

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2009

Table S.2 Representation of (weighted) secondary schools compared to secondary schools nationally

		National Population %	NFER Sample %
Achievement Band (Overall performance by GCSE 2008 data)	Lowest band	17	11
	2nd lowest band	18	19
	Middle band	18	24
	2nd highest band	18	23
	Highest band	20	21
	Missing	10	2
% eligible FSM (5 pt scale)	Lowest 20%	19	20
	2nd lowest 20%	19	20
	Middle 20%	19	20
	2nd highest 20%	19	20
	Highest 20%	19	20
	Missing	4	2
Secondary school type	Middle	7	<1
	Comprehensive to 16	33	25
	Comprehensive to 18	44	64
	Secondary Moderns	5	3
	Grammar	5	5
	Academies	6	2
Region	North	29	27
	Midlands	34	27
	South	37	46
Local Authority type	London Borough	13	12
	Metropolitan Authorities	21	20
	English Unitary Authorities	19	24
	Counties	47	43
Number of schools		3336	338

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100. Some information is not available for all schools and some schools included more than one respondent. Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2009

Table S.3 Representation of all schools (weighted) compared to all schools nationally

		National Population %	NFER Sample %
Achievement Band (By KS2 2008 and GCSE 2008 data)	Lowest band	17	16
	2nd lowest band	18	19
	Middle band	18	20
	2nd highest band	20	21
	Highest band	21	22
	Missing	6	1
% eligible FSM (5 pt scale)	Lowest 20%	20	20
	2nd lowest 20%	20	20
	Middle 20%	20	20
	2nd highest 20%	20	20
	Highest 20%	20	20
	Missing	1	1
Region	North	30	25
	Midlands	32	29
	South	37	46
Local Authority type	London Borough	11	11
	Metropolitan Authorities	21	18
	English Unitary Authorities	18	22
	Counties	50	49
Number of schools		20355	911

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Some information is not available for all schools and some schools included more than one respondent

Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2009

Table S.4 Comparison of the achieved (weighted) sample with the national population by grade of teacher

Role	Primary schools		Secondary schools	
	population	weighted sample	population	weighted sample
	%	%	%	%
Headteachers	10	7	2	2
Deputy Headteachers	7	10	3	4
Assistant Headteachers	4	6	6	9
Class teachers and others	78	76	89	86

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Sources: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2009, DCSF: School Workforce in England (including Local Authority level figures), January 2009 (Revised)

<http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s000874/index.shtml> [09 December 2009]

How accurately do the findings represent the national position?

Precision is a measure of the extent to which the results of different samples agree with each other. If we drew a different sample of teachers would we get the same results? The more data that is available the more precise the findings. For all schools and a 50 per cent response, the precision of that response is between 47.4 per cent and 52.6 per cent. For secondary schools the same precision is + and – 3.74 percentage points and for primary schools it is + and – 3.73 percentage points.

With the weightings applied to the data, we are confident that the omnibus sample is broadly representative of teachers nationally and provides a robust analysis of teachers' views.