



EEFective Kent Project

Appendices

October 2024

Rakhee Patel, Ceri Williams, Joseph Cook and Olivia Garner





The Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) is an independent charity dedicated to breaking the link between family income and education achievement. We support schools, nurseries, and colleges to improve teaching and learning for 2 to 19-year-olds through better use of evidence.

We do this by:

- **Summarising evidence.** Reviewing the best available evidence on teaching and learning and presenting in an accessible way.
- **Finding new evidence.** Funding independent evaluations of programmes and approaches that aim to raise the attainment of children and young people from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds.
- **Putting evidence to use.** Supporting education practitioners, as well as policymakers and other organisations, to use evidence in ways that improve teaching and learning.

We were set-up in 2011 by the Sutton Trust partnership with Impetus with a founding £125m grant from the Department for Education. In 2022, we were re-endowed with an additional £137m, allowing us to continue our work until at least 2032.

For more information about the EEF or this report please contact:

- 📍 Education Endowment Foundation
5th Floor, Millbank Tower
21–24 Millbank
SW1P 4QP
- ☎ 0207 802 1653
- 🌐 www.educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk

Contents

Appendix A1: Overview of the funded projects from the project prospectus	3
Appendix A2: Evaluation of EEFfective Kent: School Information Sheet.....	4
Appendix A3: Privacy Notice	7
Appendix A4: Baseline survey.....	11
Appendix A5: Promising Project feedback survey	19
Appendix A6: EBT feedback survey	30
Appendix A7: Case study research with schools topic guides: SLT guide	37
Appendix A7: Case study research with schools topic guide: Teaching staff guide.....	44
Appendix A8: Case study research with schools: Evidence Champions topic guide.....	48
Appendix A9: Endline survey.....	53
Appendix A10: Baseline survey analysis	70
Appendix A11: Participation in EKP strands	75
Appendix A12: Reasons for applying for participating in EKP.....	78
Appendix A13: Reasons for not applying to EKP	80
Appendix A14: How participants heard about the EKP.....	81
Appendix A15: ELE support take-up information from KCC.....	83
Appendix A16: Website Traffic data	84
Appendix A17: EBT survey analysis.....	85

Appendix A1: Overview of the funded projects from the project prospectus

	Available to	Could begin (depending on demand)...	Subject	Type	Training can be delivered...
1 st Class@Number	Years 1 - 3	Apr 2021, Sep 2021, Jan 2022	 Maths	 Targeted	 Virtual
App-based maths learning (onebillion)	EY, KS1 KS2 catch-up	Sep 2021, Jan 2022	 Maths	 Whole-class Targeted	 Virtual
Children's University	Primary (KS1-KS2) Secondary (KS3) Special	Before Apr 2022	 Wider school	 Voluntary enrichment - open to all	 Virtual  Face-to-face
Embedding Formative Assessment	Primary Secondary Special	Before Oct 2021	 Cross Curricular	 Whole class	 Virtual  Face-to-face
Nuffield Early Language Intervention	Reception	Oct 2021	 Literacy	 Targeted	 Virtual  Face-to-face
Reciprocal Reading	Year 5 to Year 9	Before Apr 2022	 Literacy	 Targeted	 Virtual  Face-to-face
Switch-on Reading	KS2 Secondary Special	Sep 2021, Nov 2021	 Literacy	 Targeted	 Virtual  Face-to-face
Thinking, Doing, Talking Science	KS2 Special (contact project team)	Sep 2021, Oct 2021, Nov 2021, Dec 2021, Jan 2022, Feb 2022	 Science	 Whole class	 Face-to-face

Appendix A2: Evaluation of EEFective Kent: School Information Sheet

What is EEFective Kent?

The EEFective Kent project is a three-year project running until August 2023 aiming to bring evidence-based programmes to Kent to improve educational outcomes. Kent County Council and the Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) are working in partnership and have created a joint funding pot worth £600,000 to support the implementation of evidence-based approaches and interventions in Kent. Kent County Council is managing the project, with support from staff at EEF. The project has three key strands of activity:

- Promising Projects in Schools: match-funded, evidence-based programmes from the EEF's 'Promising Projects'
- Evidence-based training for schools: delivering evidence-based training based on EEF guidance reports, delivered by the EEF's Research School Network
- Developing Research Champions: building Kent's capacity for evidence-informed school improvement and professional development

The EEFective Kent Project is being independently evaluated by the Institute for Employment Studies (IES).

What is the purpose of this evaluation?

The evaluation will aim to understand if the project:

- has helped to increase the uptake of evidence-based programmes in Kent schools;
- has supported collaborative working between schools.

Learning and insights from the evaluation will be used to help develop the project and also to inform future initiatives.

How is the evaluation being carried out?

The main research activities in the evaluation are:

- A short online survey of schools in Kent at two time points.
- Telephone interviews with key stakeholders involved in the project including KCC and EEF project staff, Promising Project providers, representatives from the Kent Association of Headteachers and Research Schools providing training.
- Analysis of project data, such as characteristics of the schools signing up to the project and information on their participation in Promising Projects (e.g. attendance at training, whether Promising Projects have been delivered as intended).
- Case study research with 12 schools to understand their experiences of taking part in the project.
- Analysis of pupil attainment data in EEFective Kent project schools and non-project schools (selected from a similar area in another part of the country) after the project is complete, based on publicly available data.

How will schools in Kent be asked to support the evaluation?

Online survey

KCC and the evaluation team will send your school a short online survey (no more than 10-15 minutes to complete). The survey will ask about approaches to improving pupil progress and the types of information used to make decisions on teaching and learning.

We would really appreciate if a member of the senior leadership team could complete the survey and also forward the survey link to relevant staff, such as those involved in selecting school improvement activities and, in participating schools, those who were trained to deliver Promising Projects.

As a 'thank you' for schools' time and contribution, the evaluation team will enter all participating schools into a prize draw. Five schools selected at random will be awarded £200 cash.

Case study research

Headteachers of some schools will be invited to take part in case study research. This will involve taking part in an interview of around 45 minutes about their views on the project and whether or not it has made a difference to their school.

In addition, we would like headteachers to identify up to four other members of staff who are involved in decisions about school improvement activities to take part in an interview of a similar length. This could be middle leaders/teachers delivering Promising Projects or working with Research Schools; a governor; and/or other senior leaders in the school informed about school improvement activities and spending decisions.

We can conduct the interviews by Teams or telephone at a convenient time.

Telephone interviews with Kent Headteachers

Some headteachers will be invited to participate in a telephone interview (30-45 minutes) about their experience of working on Strand 3 of the EEFective Kent project.

How will my school and teachers benefit from taking part?

Taking part is your chance to provide feedback and to help shape future school improvement initiatives in Kent and elsewhere. Your school's participation will help to strengthen the evidence on how best to help schools to access evidence-based projects to support the attainment of pupils.

For teachers who delivered Promising Projects in their schools, the interview with a researcher may provide a useful opportunity to reflect on the CPD they have accessed and how it has developed their teaching.

When will my school need to be involved in the evaluation?

Date	Activity
Autumn 2020	All Kent schools: online survey about approaches to improving pupil progress to be completed by SLT member and other relevant staff
Spring 2021	Telephone interviews with representatives of Kent Association of Headteachers
Summer 2021	Case study research with 8 schools
Spring 2022	Follow-up telephone interviews with representatives of Kent Association of Headteachers
Spring 2023	All Kent schools: follow-up online survey about approaches to improving pupil progress and, for schools that participated in EEFective Kent, their views and experiences of the project. Follow-up case study research with 8 schools; case study research with 4 additional schools
Autumn 2023	Telephone interview with SLT member of case study schools

How will IES use and protect the data collected?

All data gathered during the project will be held in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018, and GDPR and will be treated in the strictest confidence by IES. Your school's key contact details and teacher contact details for the study will be shared securely between EEF/KCC and IES with your consent so that you can be invited to participate in the evaluation.

No school or teacher will be named in any report arising from this work.

A Privacy Notice for the study is available [here](#)

Who can I contact if I have questions about the evaluation?

If you have any questions about the evaluation, you can contact the evaluation team:

Rakhee Patel, Principal Research Fellow at IES: rakhee.patel@employment-studies.co.uk

Ceri Williams, Research Fellow at IES: ceri.williams@employment-studies.co.uk

Appendix A3: Privacy Notice

Evaluation of EEFective Kent

Introduction

The EEFective Kent project is a three-year project running until August 2022 aiming to bring evidence-based programmes to Kent to improve educational outcomes. Kent County Council and the Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) are working in partnership and have created a joint funding pot worth £600,000 to support the implementation of evidence-based approaches and interventions in Kent. Kent County Council is managing the project, with support from staff at EEF.

The project has three key strands of activity:

- Promising Projects in Schools: match-funded, evidence-based programmes from the EEF's 'Promising Projects'
- Evidence-based training for schools: delivering evidence-based training based on EEF guidance reports, delivered by the EEF's Research School Network
- Developing Research Champions: building Kent's capacity for evidence-informed school improvement and professional development

The Institute for Employment Studies (IES) has been appointed by EEF and Kent County Council to conduct an evaluation of the project to understand if the project achieves its intended aims of:

- Raising educational standards in Kent, particularly for disadvantaged pupils
- Supporting schools in Kent to use evidence confidently to support their decision-making
- Supporting schools and key partners in Kent to use evidence-based approaches
- Encouraging collaborative working across the Kent school system

In line with the EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), this privacy notice sets out how the research team at IES will collect and use your personal data, and who you can contact with a query or a complaint.

We promise to respect any of your personal information which is under our control and to keep it safe. We aim to be clear when we collect your information about what we will do with it and let you know of any material changes to this notice.

What is the legal basis for processing my data?

IES is the data controller for this project. IES' legal basis for processing personal data is 'legitimate interests'. The evaluation of EEFective Kent fulfils one of IES' core business purposes (undertaking research, evaluation and information activities) and is therefore in our legitimate interest, that processing personal information is necessary for the conduct of the evaluation.

What kind of information do we collect?

The research will involve:

- Interviews with key partners and stakeholders in the EEFective Kent project.
- An online survey of headteachers and other school staff, which will be sent to all schools in Kent.
- Analysis of data collected by Kent County Council and other stakeholders such as Promising Project providers and EEF Research Schools, who will deliver training to schools. This could include information on schools participating in particular training courses and numbers and types of staff attending and completing training.
- Case study research with schools, including interviews with up to five members of school staff from each case study school.
- Analysis of publicly available data on attainment of schools in Kent and other parts of the country.

Personal data (i.e. name, job role, email address and telephone number) will only be collected where it is necessary: either to send invitations to participate in the research or where it is relevant to the interview/survey to contextualise your responses. For the purposes of sending invitations to take part in the research, this information will either be obtained from publicly available sources (e.g. your organisation's website) or supplied by Kent County Council or the Education Endowment Foundation with your explicit consent.

How will my data be treated?

We take all reasonable steps to protect your personal information and follow procedures designed to prevent unauthorised access, alteration, loss or disclosure of your information. Where personal information is collected, these details will be stored on an encrypted server with access restricted solely to members of the IES research team.

We have put in place procedures to deal with any suspected personal data breach and will notify you and any applicable regulator of a breach where we are legally required to do so.

If you are invited and choose to take part in an interview, survey or case study for this project, the data you give will be used for research purposes only. IES will produce a report that summarises the main findings from all these research activities. Individuals will not be named, nor will any information be included that could reveal your identity, except with your explicit permission.

We will only retain your personal data for as long as necessary to fulfil the purposes we collected it for. Your personal information, interview notes and survey responses will be securely deleted from the IES systems six months after the project is complete (currently estimated to be December 2023).

Who else has access to your information?

The IES research team may disclose your information to third parties in connection with the purposes of processing your personal data set out in this notice. These third parties may include suppliers, research assistants, trusted academic partners and subcontractors who may process information on behalf of the research team to carry out such work as undertaking interviews or transcribing interviews. In all cases, the Research Team will ensure that these third parties enter

into appropriate data processing agreements with us and that they keep your personal data secure and confidential.

We may also disclose your personal information if required by law, or to protect or defend ourselves or others against illegal or harmful activities, or as part of a reorganisation or restructuring of our organisations.

Your legal rights

Under certain circumstances, you have rights under data protection laws in relation to your personal data, including the rights to:

- Request access to your personal data: this enables you to receive a copy of the personal data we hold about you and to check we are lawfully processing it.
- Withdraw the information you have provided as part of the interviews or survey up to two weeks after you have submitted your response.

Please see the [Information Commissioner's Office website for a full description of your legal rights](#).

If you wish to exercise any of the rights set out above in connection with this research project, please contact Dafni Papoutsaki, Research Fellow at IES on Dafni.Papoutsaki@employment-studies.co.uk

Who can I contact with a query about how my data will be used?

If you have any questions about how your data will be used, please contact the Project Director or Project Manager for the evaluation:

Rakhee Patel, Principal Research Fellow at IES (Project Director): Rakhee.Patel@employment-studies.co.uk

Dafni Papoutsaki, Research Fellow at IES (Project Manager): Dafni.Papoutsaki@employment-studies.co.uk

Who can I contact with a complaint?

Under GDPR, you have the right to lodge a complaint with the Information Commissioner's Office at www.ico.org.uk. We would, however, appreciate the chance to deal with your concerns before you approach the ICO, so please contact IES in the first instance.

Company details for the research team and funders of the evaluation

The Institute for Employment Studies is a charitable company limited by guarantee registered in England.

Registration number: 931547

Charity registration number: 258930

Registered office: Institute for Employment Studies, City Gate, 185 Dyke Road, Brighton, BN3 1 TL6

Email: Dafni.Papoutsaki@employment-studies.co.uk

The Education Endowment Foundation is a charity registered in England

Charity registration number: 1142111

Company number: 07587909

Registered office: Millbank Tower, 21-24 Millbank, London SW1P 4QP

Email: info@eefoundation.org.uk

Kent County Council

Registered office: Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone ME14 1XQ

Email: EEFectiveKentProject@kent.gov.uk

Appendix A4: Baseline survey

Introduction

Thank you very much for taking part in this survey.

Your responses will contribute to a study being carried out by the Institute for Employment Studies (IES) as part of Kent County Council's and the Education Endowment Foundation's EEFective Kent Project. The EEFective Kent Project aims to improve educational outcomes for children across Kent. In support of this aim, the survey explores different approaches to support pupil progress, including how decisions to introduce new approaches are made.

We are interested in hearing from all schools in Kent, whether you are taking part in the EEFective Kent Project or not. Your views and experiences matter. To say thank you for the time you are giving to complete the survey, participating schools will be entered in a prize draw when the survey closes. The 5 selected schools will be awarded £200 cash each*.

The survey should take around 10-15 minutes to complete. Your answers will be treated confidentially, which means that you and your school will not be identified in any reports produced from this research. Your personal details and responses will not be shared with anyone outside the IES research team and no one within your school, Kent County Council or the Education Endowment Foundation will be able to see your answers. Further details about how data is used in this research can be found in the **privacy notice**.

*Each school can only be entered once in the prize draw.

Q1 What is your job role? (Please tick one box below that best describes your role)

1. Headteacher /principal
2. Other senior manager / leader (e.g. director, deputy or assistant headteacher)
3. Middle leader (e.g. head of department, subject or curriculum area leader, key stage leader, pastoral services leader)
4. Classroom teacher
5. Support staff / teaching assistant
6. School manager / bursar
7. Research lead
8. Other role (please specify)

Q2 How long have you been in the teaching profession? (Please tick the box that describes the length of your whole teaching career, including career breaks)

1. 30 years or more
2. 20-29 years
3. 10-19 years
4. 5-9 years
5. 1-4 years
6. First year of teaching (NQT)

Your general approach to teaching and learning to support pupils' progress

[if answered 1, 2, 3, 6,7,8 to Q1= not class teacher or TA/support staff]

We would like you to think broadly about how your school develops teaching to support pupil progress

Q3 To what extent does your school consult the following sources when identifying areas for improvement to support pupil progress? (Please tick one box in each row)

	A lot	Some/ a little	Not at all	N/A
National test data				
Internal test data				
Lesson observation data				
OFSTED				
Surveys / interviews				
Reviews, feedback or data from local authority / The Education People				

[if answered 1, 2, 3, 6,7,8 to Q1= not class teacher or TA/support staff]

Q4 To what extent does your school consult the following sources when deciding how to address school improvement issues that have been identified? (Please tick one box in each row)

	A lot	Some/ a little	Not at all	N/A
Reviews, feedback or data from local authority/ The Education People,				
Academy chains/multi-academy trusts, including their experts				
Private sector organisations (commercial, specialists, educational consultancies)				
The Chartered College of Teaching				
Other school networks (e.g. teaching schools alliances, maths hubs)				
Articles, reports, books or summaries based on academic research				
Articles, reports, books or summaries based on teacher experience				
Information gathered through training / CPD				
Education Endowment Foundation Teaching and Learning Toolkit/website				
The Research Schools network				
Online evidence platforms or databases eg NFER, CUREE				
ResearchEd events				
National Leaders of Education and / or Kent Leaders of Education				
Mentors (in my school or another school)				
Guidance from exam boards				
Colleagues within the school				
Colleagues in other schools				

Media (eg TES, Schools Weekly)				
Social media (Twitter, blogs)				

[Ask all]

Q5 When deciding on approaches to support pupil progress, what factors affect your decisions? (Please rate the level of influence that each of the following factors has on your decisions about adopting approaches to support pupil progress)

	Strong influence	Some influence	No influence	N/A
How straightforward an approach is to implement				
How popular an approach is likely to be with staff				
How popular an approach is likely to be with parents				
How popular an approach is likely to be with pupils				
How inexpensive an approach is				
Whether an approach is backed by academic research				
Whether an approach is a good fit with existing practices				
Whether an approach is aligned with your professional experience				
Whether an approach has been used by other schools in your network with positive feedback				

[Ask all]

Q6 How (if at all) do you use research information in your work? By 'research' we mean information from books, reports, articles, summaries, training or events that is based on academic studies. (Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	N/A
Information from research plays an important role in informing my/our teaching practice						
I believe that using information from research will help to improve pupil outcomes						
I know where to find relevant research that may help to inform teaching methods/practice						
My school leaders/governors encourage me to use information from research to improve my practice						
I am able to relate information from research to my context						

Other staff in my school use information from research to inform their teaching practice						
I find it easy to understand information from research						
I feel confident about analysing information from research						
Information from research conducted elsewhere is of value to our school						
I use information from research to help me to decide how to implement new approaches in the classroom						

[if answered 1, 2, 3, 6,7,8 to Q1= not class teacher or TA/support staff]

Q7 Which (if any) of the following measures has your school focused on over the last two years to support pupil progress? (Please tick as many boxes as applicable).

	Yes, implemented in last 2 years	Yes, plan to implement this year	N/A
Improving feedback between teachers and pupils			
More teaching of metacognition and self-regulation strategies			
Improving teaching of reading comprehension strategies			
Using mastery learning approaches			
Using collaborative learning approaches			
Early years interventions			
One to one tuition			
Oral language interventions			
Peer-to-peer tutoring schemes for pupils			
Improving approach to homework			
Other (please specify)			

[if answered 1, 2, 3, 6,7,8 to Q1= not class teacher or TA/support staff]

Q8 Which, if any, of the following were important in identifying the measure(s) you named above? (Please tick all that apply)

1. Ideas generated by me or my school
2. Ideas from other schools
3. Advice from my academy chain, local authority or The Education People
4. Articles, reports, books or summaries based on academic research (paper or web based)
5. based)

6. Articles, reports, books or summaries based on teacher experience (paper or web based)
7. The promotional materials of an external supplier
8. Action research conducted by me or my colleagues
9. Information gathered through training/CPD
10. Online evidence platforms or databases (e.g. the Education Endowment Foundation Teaching and Learning Toolkit)
11. Guidance from official bodies such as DfE and Ofsted
12. Guidance from exam boards
13. Don't know
14. Other (please specify)

[if answered 1, 2, 3, 6,7,8 to Q1= not class teacher or TA/support staff]

Q9 Has your school used any of the following programmes (from the EEF's Promising Projects list) in the last two years? (Please tick as many boxes as applicable)

	Yes, implemented in last 2 years	Yes, plan to implement this year
1stClass@Number		
app-based maths learning (onebillion)		
Children's University		
Embedding Formative Assessment		
Mathematical Reasoning		
Nuffield Early Language Intervention		
Philosophy for Children		
Accelerated Reader		
ReflectED Metacognition		
Reciprocal Reading		
Stop and Think: Learning Counterintuitive Concepts		
Switch-on Reading		
Thinking, Doing, Talking Science		
Improving Working Memory / Working Memory Plus		

Don't know

Supporting professional learning

[Ask all]

Q10 How does your school environment support professional learning? (Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	N/A
My school facilitates a professional learning community						
My school has formal processes to help staff critically engage with information sources						
My school makes time available for staff to use a variety of information sources						
My school allocates budget to professional learning activities for its staff						
My school has a research lead i.e. a 'go to' person to help with access to research						
My school encourages experimentation with different approaches to teaching						
My school values the introduction of new ideas about teaching and learning						

Working with other schools

[Ask all]

Q11 This question aims to find out about how (if at all) you work with other schools in Kent. (Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	N/A
My school has good processes/structures in place to support collaborative working with other schools						
My school works in partnership with other schools to jointly develop practice through mutual support and challenge						
My school has developed its capacity for self-evaluation through peer-to-peer work						
The partnerships in which my school has been involved have been mutually beneficial for all participating schools						
The partnerships my school is currently involved in are likely to be sustained						
There are good arrangements in place in Kent to support collaboration between schools						

Participating in the Promising Projects

[if answered 1, 2, 3, 6,7,8 to Q1= not class teacher or TA/support staff]

Q12 Has your school submitted an application for the Promising Projects strand of the EEFective Kent project? (Please tick one box below)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

[if Q12= yes]

Q13 Why did you apply for a Promising Project as part of the EEFective Kent Project? (Please select all that apply)

1. The programmes that our school applied for are supported by robust evidence
2. The programmes that our school applied for are clearly described
3. The programmes that our school applied for are appropriate to my school's needs
4. The funding has allowed our school to implement programmes we were previously interested in

5. Our school was already planning to implement a Promising Project this year, so it made sense to access this funding
6. The application process was straightforward and simple
7. The matched funding was a strong incentive
8. The contribution required was equal to or less than the budget our school usually spends on programmes
9. Other schools we work with share the same interest in the programmes that I applied for
10. Our school wasn't aware of the intervention(s) until we heard about it through the EEFective Kent programme
11. Other (please specify)

[if Q12= yes]

Q14 Where did you hear about the Promising Projects strand of EEFective Kent Project? (Please select all that apply)

1. KELSI website
2. KELSI newsletter
3. Headteacher briefings
4. Promising Projects Roadshow (virtual or face-to-face)
5. Social Media (Facebook/Twitter/Linked in)
6. The Education People
7. Kent Association of Headteachers
8. Local Inclusion Forum Team (LIFT)
9. ResearchEd event
10. Education Endowment Foundation website
11. Governors
12. Other (please specify)
- 13.

[If Q12= no, has not applied]

Q15 Why have you not applied? (Please select all that apply)

1. We are unaware of the EEFective Kent Project / Promising Projects strand of EEFective Kent
2. None of the programmes are appropriate to the school's needs
3. The funding was not sufficient
4. The school's contribution was too high
5. Our school was unaware of the matched-funding opportunities
6. The application process was too complicated
7. Lack of time and capacity to apply
8. The school does not have the capacity to deliver the programmes
9. Insufficient interest in the programmes offered among school leadership
10. Our school had previously done all the Promising Project interventions that were appropriate to our needs
11. Other please specify

Appendix A5: Promising Project feedback survey

Experience of Promising Projects survey

Introduction

Thank you for agreeing to take part in our survey about your experiences of participating in Promising Projects. This survey forms part of the evaluation of the EEFective Kent project, which has been commissioned by the Education Endowment Foundation and is being carried out by the Institute for Employment Studies. The findings from the survey will be used to form recommendations that will help support the future development of the EEFective Kent project and similar future initiatives.

The survey should take **no more than 10 minutes to complete**.

Your answers will be treated confidentially, which means that you and your school will not be identified in any reports produced from this research. Your personal details and responses will not be shared with anyone outside the IES research team and no one within your school, Kent County Council or the Education Endowment Foundation will be able to see your answers. Further details about how data is used in this research can be found in the **privacy notice**.

If you have any questions about the survey or the evaluation, you can contact Ceri Williams (ceri.williams@employment-studies.co.uk) at IES.

If you need to change your answers to the survey at any point, you can use the 'Reset' button at the bottom of the page.

If you need to change a previous question or look a page or two ahead, you can use the 'Back' and 'Next' buttons at the bottom of the page to navigate through the survey.

Background

Q1 Which Promising Project have you just completed?

1. 1stClass@Number
2. App-based maths learning (onebillion)
3. Children's University
4. Embedding Formative Assessment
5. Nuffield Early Language Intervention
6. Reciprocal Reading
7. Switch-on Reading
8. Thinking, Doing, Talking Science
9. SAPERE Philosophy for Children

Q2 Please can I check, when did you finish the training?

Date box (MM/YYYY)

Q3 What is your job role? (Please tick one box below that best describes your role)

1. Headteacher /principal

2. Other senior leader (e.g. director, deputy or assistant headteacher)
3. Teacher
4. TA/INA
5. SENCO
6. Pastoral leader
7. Other role (please specify)

Q4 How long have you been in the teaching profession? (Please tick the box that describes the length of your whole teaching career, including career breaks)

1. 30 years or more
2. 20-29 years
3. 10-19 years
4. 5-9 years
5. 3-4 years
6. 1-2 years (ECT/NQT)

Experience of the Promising Projects Training

Thinking about the Promising Projects Training you recently completed....

Q5 Please indicate the extent to which you either agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I have found the Promising Projects Training useful					
I have found the resources (videos, handouts, reading material etc) that have been shared helpful					
The online mode of delivery has worked well					
I have actively engaged and collaborated with other school leaders/professionals in my cohort					
I have actively participated in sessions					
The trainers have relevant knowledge and experience					
The training I have received is relevant to the issues and context of my organisation					

I would recommend the training programme to others wanting to develop their knowledge and skills					
--	--	--	--	--	--

Q6 What do you think are the best features of the Promising Projects Training?

Open text: 600 characters

Q7 Do you have any suggestions for how the Promising Projects Training could be improved?

Open text: 600 characters

Knowledge and skills gained from the Promising Projects Training

The following questions are about your views on the extent to which the Promising Projects Training you have just completed has led to improvements in your confidence, knowledge and understanding.

Q8 Please indicate the extent to which you either agree or disagree with the following statements.

Taking part in the Promising Projects Training has...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Improved my understanding of the evidence base					
Improved my understanding of the EEF Toolkit					
Improved my skills in exploring in detail the problems in my school					
Improved my ability to tightly define areas for improvement in my school					
Improved my understanding of evidence-based strategies to reduce the attainment gap					
Improved my skills in making evidence-informed decisions about what to implement in my school					
Improved my skills in developing an evidence-informed implementation plan for change					
Improved my knowledge about how to practically prepare for introducing changes in my school					
Improved my understanding of how to implement and manage changes in my school					

Improved my skills in evaluating the impact of changes that have introduced					
Improved my understanding of how to sustain and scale up innovations that have proved successful					
Improved my confidence in being able to create a leadership environment that is conducive to implementing research -based practice					

Applying knowledge

Q9 As a result of the Promising Projects Training that you have recently completed....

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I intend to implement new practices in my school					
I intend to devise new strategies for an aspect of school improvement					
I have improved my professional networks					
I have used research and evidence more effectively in my decision-making					
I have introduced evidence informed changes in my school.					

[For those who respond strongly agree/agree to Q9d 'I have used research and evidence more effectively in my decision-making']:

Q10 Please briefly describe how you have used research and evidence more effectively in your decision-making

Open text: 600 characters

[For those who respond strongly agree/agree to Q9e 'I have introduced evidence informed changes in my school']:

Q11 Please briefly describe the changes you have introduced as a result of the Promising Projects Training

Open text: 600 characters

[Ask ALL]

Applying to take part in the Promising Projects Training

Q 12 Why did you apply for a Promising Projects Training course? (Please select all that apply)

1. The course was supported by robust evidence
2. The course was clearly described
3. The course that our school applied for was appropriate to my school's needs
4. The funding has allowed our school to tackle areas we were previously interested in
5. Our school was already planning to access CPD in this area, so it made sense to access this funding
6. The application process was straightforward and simple
7. The matched funding was a strong incentive
8. The contribution required was equal to or less than the budget our school usually spends on CPD
9. Other schools we work with share the same interest in the courses that I applied for
10. Other (please specify)

Q13 Where did you hear about the Promising Projects Training strand of EEFective Kent Project? (Please select all that apply)

1. KELSI website
2. KELSI newsletter
3. Headteacher briefings
4. Social Media (Facebook/Twitter/Linked in)
5. The Education People
6. Kent Association of Headteachers
7. Local Inclusion Forum Team (LIFT)
8. ResearchEd event
9. Education Endowment Foundation website
10. Governors
11. Other (please specify)

Q14 Did you access the EEF's training on Putting Evidence to Work: A School's Guide to implementation? You may have done this training online or face-to-face. (This is also known as Online Implementation Training).

This training is about evidence-informed school improvement and introduces a cycle with 5 steps: 1. Decide what you want to achieve. 2. Identify possible solutions and strategies. 3. Give the idea the best chance of success. 4. Did it work? 5. Secure and spread change.

1. Yes
2. No (go to Q18)
3. Don't know (go to Q19)

[If yes to Q14:]

Q15 Please indicate the extent to which you either agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I found the 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training useful					
I would recommend the 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training to other school leaders					
The 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training was relevant to the issues and context of my organisation					
The 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training helped me to target a realistic priority to target through new training					
The implementation training helped me to identify which Promising Projects Training Course(s) to apply for					

Q16 Do you have any suggestions for how the 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training could be improved?

Open text: 600 characters

Q17 What do you think are the best features of the 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training?

Open text: 600 characters

[If no to Q14 did not access the EEF's training on Putting Evidence to Work]:

Q18 Why did you not access the EEF's training on Putting Evidence to Work: A School's Guide to implementation?

1. I was unaware of the availability of the training
2. The training was not appropriate to my needs
3. The training was not appropriate to my school's needs
4. I did not like the online mode of access
5. Lack of time and capacity to do the training
6. I have done the training previous
7. Other (please specify) open text response

[Ask ALL]

Implementation of the Promising Projects training

Route to appropriate set of questions from answer at Q1.

Thinking about the Promising Projects Training you recently completed.

On a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (completely), to what extent did the following take place in your school

Q19 Add fidelity matrices here but only ask one set (depending on what they said at Q1)

1stClass@Number

On a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (completely), to what extent did the following take place in your school?	Not at all		Somewhat		Completely	
	1	2	3	4	5	
TAs joined five 1 hour training sessions (via Zoom) covering mathematical subject knowledge and pedagogy						
Link teacher joined a 1 x ½ hour launch briefing (by Zoom)						
TA started working with pupils straight after their first training session (the following day or asap after that)						
Up to 30 half-hour sessions delivered to a group of up to four children (in addition to normal class maths lessons)						
Sessions delivered for between 10-15 weeks						
Link teacher received remote support on supporting, managing and evaluating 1stClass@Number						

Onebillion Maths Learning

On a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (completely), to what extent did the following take place in your school?	Not at all		Somewhat		Completely	
	1	2	3	4	5	
TAs completed online training module						
TAs allowed 3 hours for training overall and preparation time of five minutes per session						
Pupils were able to access the app with support from TAs						
Pupils worked with the app for 30 minutes a day, four days each week over a 12-week period (in addition to normal maths teaching)						
TAs monitored 10 pupils or less per cohort						

TAs aware of specialist tech support and manual/accompanying videos to support implementation

Embedding Formative Assessment

On a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (completely), to what extent did the following take place in your school?	Not at all		Somewhat		Completely	
	1	2	3	4	5	
School leaders and teachers leading Teacher Learning Community (TLC) meetings attended the initial day's training.						
School received two visits (either virtually or face-to-face visits) at the end of year one and two to review the programme and plan the next steps in implementation						
School held regular depth meetings, facilitated by a TLC leader (9 meetings throughout the year, every 4 weeks approximately, for a minimum of 75 minutes)						
Teachers completed action plans at the end of each TLC meeting						
Teachers regularly given opportunities to be observed by their peers and receive feedback on their practice						
Supporting resources utilised to inform practice (including support from mentor plus exemplars and case studies)						

Reciprocal Reading

On a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (completely), to what extent did the following take place in your school?	Not at all		Somewhat		Completely	
	1	2	3	4	5	
Lead teacher and identified teachers/TAs attended 2 training days						
Teachers/TAs attended two half day training visits from FFT Literacy staff (either in person or virtually)						
Teachers/TAs taught groups that consisted of 4-8 children						
Teachers/TA taught two 20–30-minute session per week						
Teacher/TA ran sessions for 12-16 weeks (in addition to normal reading/English classes)						
Book sets used were appropriate for each session						

Children's University

On a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (completely), to what extent did the following take place in your school?	Not at all		Somewhat		Completely	
	1	2	3	4	5	
CU Co-ordinator attended initial induction session (2 hours at start of year)						
CU Co-ordinator utilised resources they received to support the programme						
School utilised CU e-Learning materials for staff						
Teachers allowed 1-2 hours per term for children to log activities						
CU Co-ordinator spent 1 hour per week organising activities and supporting teachers to run after school clubs						

Thinking, Doing, Talking Science

On a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (completely), to what extent did the following take place in your school?	Not at all		Somewhat		Completely	
	1	2	3	4	5	
Teachers involved in TDTS attended four days of training spread out over the academic year						
Gap tasks completed by teachers between each day of the course (can be carried out as normal science teaching)						
At least two teachers from the school took part						
TDTS teachers develop science lessons that encourage pupils to use higher order thinking skills						
Dedicated discussion times are planned to enable pupils to think and talk about scientific concepts						
Pupils are regularly provided with a wide range of opportunities for investigations and problem solving						

Switch-on Reading

On a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (completely), to what extent did the following take place in your school?	Not at all		Somewhat		Completely	
	1	2	3	4	5	
TAs attended initial training day, one-and-a-half hour follow up visit (three-to-four weeks later) and final day of external training						

in-person or virtually to address issues	
Intervention Coordinator attended initial training day	
Switch-on Reading delivered over a 10-week duration	
TAs delivered Switch-on to at least two pupils daily	
Switch-on followed structure of 20-minute one-to-one session followed by 10 minutes for reflection and planning	
All trained staff receive and use the switch-on resources folder and can access the website for further materials if needed	

Philosophy for Children (P4C)

On a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (completely), to what extent did the following take place in your school?	Not at all		Somewhat		Completely	
	1	2	3	4	5	
All teachers participating in P4C undertook two days of training (in the form of one inset day + two twilight sessions, or two inset days)						
Training days spaced apart by a maximum of one term						
Three in-school support days utilised						
P4C classroom sessions timetabled after initial Inset day and the approach is used with students						
Regular P4C sessions timetabled and undertaken						

NELI

On a scale of 1 (note at all) to 5 (completely), to what extent did the following take place in your school?	Not at all		Somewhat		Completely	
	1	2	3	4	5	
Reception teacher attended introductory training virtually or in person (half day workshop)						
TA(s) responsible for delivering NELI completed practitioner training (2-day course, virtually or in person, follow-up webinar and a half-day workshop to review progress)						
Pupils were selected for NELI based on the eligibility criteria specified by the provider						

Three 30-minute group sessions were delivered each week for 20 weeks (using the lesson plans and resources provided)	
Two 15-minute individual sessions were delivered each week for 20 weeks	
NELI sessions were delivered for 20 weeks	

[Ask ALL]

Q20 Has the Promising Project intervention been implemented in your school in a consistent manner according to your understanding of what was required by the provider?

8. Fully/mostly
9. Somewhat
10. Little/not at all

[If select 'somewhat' or 'little/not at all']:

Why was the programme not fully implemented as intended?

[open text 120 word limit]

Q21 Have any of the following factors inhibited implementing the programme as required:

1. Pupil absence
2. Pupil/class time not ringfenced by the school
3. Staff absence
4. Staff time not ringfenced by the school
5. Lack of support from school leadership
6. School closure due to COVID-19
7. None of the above apply to the school, but there were other factors that inhibited implementing the programme
8. None of the above, there were no factors that inhibited implementing the programme
9. Other (please specify)

Q22 Is the school monitoring the impact of the programme on the progress of pupils involved?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

End and thanks

Appendix A6: EBT feedback survey

Evidence-based training experience survey

Introduction

Thank you for agreeing to take part in our survey about your experiences of participating in an Evidence-Based Training course. This survey forms part of the evaluation of the EEFective Kent project, which has been commissioned by the Education Endowment Foundation and is being carried out by the Institute for Employment Studies. The findings from the survey will be used to form recommendations that will help support the future development of the EEFective Kent project and similar future initiatives.

The survey should take **no more than 10 minutes to complete**.

Your answers will be treated confidentially, which means that you and your school will not be identified in any reports produced from this research. Your personal details and responses will not be shared with anyone outside the IES research team and no one within your school, Kent County Council or the Education Endowment Foundation will be able to see your answers. Further details about how data is used in this research can be found in the **privacy notice**.

If you have any questions about the survey or the evaluation, you can contact Ceri Williams (ceri.williams@employment-studies.co.uk) at IES.

If you need to change your answers to the survey at any point, you can use the 'Reset' button at the bottom of the page.

If you need to change a previous question or look a page or two ahead, you can use the 'Back' and 'Next' buttons at the bottom of the page to navigate through the survey.

Background

Q1 Which Evidence-Based Training course have you just completed?

1. SEND and Learning Behaviours
2. Training and Retaining Great Teachers
3. Delivery of Online Learning
4. Evidence-informed Curriculum Development
5. Tackling Educational Disadvantage (previously known as Characteristics of Deprivation)
6. Improving Memory and Metacognition

Q2 Please can I check, when did you finish the course?

Date box (MM/YYYY)

Q3 What is your job role? (Please tick one box below that best describes your role)

7. Headteacher /principal
8. Other senior leader (e.g. director, deputy or assistant headteacher)
9. Teacher

10. TA/INA
11. SENCO
12. Pastoral leader
13. Other role (please specify)

Q4 How long have you been in the teaching profession? (Please tick the box that describes the length of your whole teaching career, including career breaks)

1. 30 years or more
2. 20-29 years
3. 10-19 years
4. 5-9 years
5. 3-4 years
6. 1-2 years (ECT/NQT)

Experience of the Evidence-Based Training

Thinking about the Evidence-Training you recently completed....

Q5 Please indicate the extent to which you either agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I have found the Evidence-Based Training useful					
I have found the resources (videos, handouts, reading material etc) that have been shared helpful					
The online mode of delivery has worked well					
I have actively engaged and collaborated with other school leaders/professionals in my cohort					
I have actively participated in sessions					
The Research School trainers have relevant knowledge and experience					
The training I have received is relevant to the issues and context of my organisation					

I would recommend the training programme to others wanting to develop their knowledge and skills					
--	--	--	--	--	--

Q6 What do you think are the best features of the Evidence-Based Training?

Open text: 600 characters

Q7 Have you accessed any one-to-one support from an Evidence Leader in Education (ELE) as part of the Evidence-Based Training?

1. Yes
2. No (go to Q12)
3. Not yet, but I intend to in future (go to Q12)

[If Q7 is yes]:

Q8 Please briefly describe how the one-to-one ELE support worked

Open text: 600 characters

Q9 Indicate the extent to which you either agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I found the one-to-one ELE support useful					

[For those who respond strongly agree/agree to Q9]:

Q10 Please briefly describe why you found the one-to-one ELE support useful

Open text: 600 characters

[If Q7 is yes]:

Q11 Do you have any suggestions for how the Evidence-Based Training could be improved?

Open text: 600 characters

Knowledge and skills gained from the Evidence-Based Training

The following questions are about your views on the extent to which the Evidence-Based Training you have just completed has led to improvements in your confidence, knowledge and understanding.

Q12 Please indicate the extent to which you either agree or disagree with the following statements.

Taking part in the Evidence-Based Training has...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree

Improved my understanding of the evidence base					
Improved my understanding of the EEF Toolkit					
Improved my skills in exploring in detail the problems in my school					
Improved my ability to tightly define areas for improvement in my school					
Improved my understanding of evidence-based strategies to reduce the attainment gap					
Improved my skills in making evidence-informed decisions about what to implement in my school					
Improved my skills in developing an evidence-informed implementation plan for change					
Improved my knowledge about how to practically prepare for introducing changes in my school					
Improved my understanding of how to implement and manage changes in my school					
Improved my skills in evaluating the impact of changes that have introduced					
Improved my understanding of how to sustain and scale up innovations that have proved successful					
Improved my confidence in being able to create a leadership environment that is conducive to implementing evidence-based practice					

Applying knowledge

Q13 As a result of the Evidence-Based Training that you have recently completed....

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I intend to implement new evidence-based practices in my school					
I intend to devise an evidence-informed strategy for an aspect of school improvement					

I have improved my professional networks					
I have used research and evidence more effectively in my decision-making					
I have introduced evidence-informed changes in my school.					

[For those who respond strongly agree/agree to Q13d 'I have used research and evidence more effectively in my decision-making']:

Q14 Please briefly describe how you have used research and evidence more effectively in your decision-making
Open text: 600 characters

[For those who respond strongly agree/agree to Q13e 'I have introduced evidence-informed changes in my school']:

Q15 Please briefly describe the changes you have introduced as a result of the Evidence-Based Training
Open text: 600 characters

[Ask ALL]

Applying to take part in the Evidence-Based Training

Q16 Why did you apply for an Evidence-Based Training course? (Please select all that apply)

1. The course was supported by robust evidence
2. The course was clearly described
3. The course that our school applied for was appropriate to my school's needs
4. The funding has allowed our school to tackle areas we were previously interested in
5. Our school was already planning to access CPD in this area, so it made sense to access this funding
6. The application process was straightforward and simple
7. The matched funding was a strong incentive
8. The contribution required was equal to or less than the budget our school usually spends on CPD
9. Other schools we work with share the same interest in the courses that I applied for
10. Other (please specify)

Q17 Where did you hear about the Evidence-Based Training strand of EEFective Kent Project? (Please select all that apply)

1. KELSI website
2. KELSI newsletter
3. Headteacher briefings
4. Social Media (Facebook/Twitter/Linked in)
5. The Education People
6. Kent Association of Headteachers

7. Local Inclusion Forum Team (LIFT)
8. ResearchEd event
9. Education Endowment Foundation website
10. Governors
11. Other (please specify)

Q18 Did you access the EEF's training on Putting Evidence to Work: A School's Guide to implementation? You may have done this training online or face-to-face. (This is also known as Online Implementation Training).

This training is about evidence-informed school improvement and introduces a cycle with 5 steps: 1. Decide what you want to achieve. 2. Identify possible solutions and strategies. 3. Give the idea the best chance of success. 4. Did it work? 5. Secure and spread change.

1. Yes
2. No (go to Q22)
3. Don't know (go to the end)

[If yes to Q18]

Q19 Please indicate the extent to which you either agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I found the 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training useful					
I would recommend the 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training to other school leaders					
The 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training was relevant to the issues and context of my organisation					
The 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training helped me to target a realistic priority to target through new training					
The implementation training helped me to identify which Evidence-Based Training Courses /to apply for					

Q20 Do you have any suggestions for how the 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training could be improved?

Open text: 600 characters

Q21 What do you think are the best features of the 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training?

Open text: 600 characters

[If no, to Q18 did not access the EEF's training on Putting Evidence to Work]:

Q22 Why did you not access the EEF's training on Putting Evidence to Work: A School's Guide to implementation?

1. I was unaware of the availability of the training
2. The training was not appropriate to my needs
3. The training was not appropriate to my school's needs
4. I did not like the online mode of access
5. Lack of time and capacity to do the training
6. I have done the training previous
7. Other (please specify) open text response

End and thanks

Appendix A7: Case study research with schools topic guides: SLT guide

EEFective Kent – SLT Topic Guide

Thank you for agreeing to take part in an interview about EEFective Kent.

I work for IES, an independent, not-for-profit, research organisation. We have been appointed by the Education Endowment Foundation, with support from Kent County Council, to carry out the evaluation of EEFective Kent. The evaluation will aim to understand whether the project has helped to increase the uptake of evidence-based programmes in Kent schools and has supported collaborative working between schools. Learning and insights from the evaluation will be used to help develop the project and also to inform future initiatives. Our discussion today will cover details of your current use of research, your involvement in the project, and your views on progress to date. It will take around 45 minutes.

Participation is voluntary and you can stop at any time. If you do not want to answer a question, let me know and we can move on.

Before we begin, I want to run through some general information with you:

- Everything discussed in the interview is confidential and will only be used for the purposes of this research.
- We will write a report based on our findings for EEF. The information you share today will be anonymised in the report. It means that we will talk about the main themes that came out of all the discussions we have had with stakeholders but will not identify anyone. Please feel free to answer the questions as openly and honestly as possible
- With your permission I would like to record the interview – I'll be taking notes as we talk but it helps to have a back-up. The recording will be stored securely and will only be accessible to the IES team. It will be deleted 6 months after the end of the project.

Do you have any questions before we start?

A: Background

1. Can you tell me a bit about your **role in the school and your responsibilities** in relation to the EEFective Kent project? How long have you been in the role? *Researcher to confirm which elements of EEFective Kent the school has been involved in: Promising Projects, Evidence-based training or both.*
2. Can you tell me about **your school**? *Probe: Location, key challenges facing the school, size, proportion of students eligible for FSM*

B: Motivations for taking part

3. **Where did you hear about the EEFective Kent project?**
 - a. *Probe: roadshow, KELSI communications, headteacher briefings, other*
 - b. What information did you receive?

- c. What did you think about the information you received?
 - d. What appealed/did not appeal?
4. **Why did your school decide to participate in EEFective Kent?** *Probe for: location/context of the school, school performance, school strategy, leadership support for use of evidence, research use culture, access to EEF materials.*
- a. Were there specific areas of improvement you wanted to address? *Probe for relation to broader strategy*
 - b. What did you/your school expect to gain?
 - c. To what extent was the matched funding a factor?
 - d. Did you have any concerns about taking part?

C: Implementation Training - Putting evidence to work

Researcher note: As a pre-requisite for applying for a Promising Project, SLT members of schools that applied were required to access EEF training to prepare them to implement a Promising Project. The training could have been accessed online or as a short session at headteacher briefings, EEFective Kent roadshows or at events for NLEs or KLEs. The training covered the following key areas: treating implementation as a process, not an event; creating a leadership environment and school climate that is conducive to good implementation; defining the problem you want to solve and identifying appropriate programmes or practices to implement; creating a clear implementation plan; supporting staff; planning for sustaining and scaling an intervention from the outset.

The following questions should therefore be focussed on schools who took part in a Promising Project. For other schools, briefly check awareness of the training, and move on if they have not heard of it.

5. Did you access the **Implementation Training** delivered by EEF? Why/why not?
- If so:
- a. How did you do the training - online or face to face?
 - b. How accessible did you find the training? *Explore time to take part and do the training, (if accessed face to face) the location, level at which the training is pitched*
 - c. Were there any barriers to doing the training?
- If not:
- a. Is there a need for this type of training? Why/why not?
 - b. How relevant or not do you consider the training to be?
6. How **useful** did you find the training? *Probe for whether the information was new to them, relevance of the information.*
7. How, if at all, did the training **influence your choice of Promising Project**?
8. To what extent did the training **prepare you to deliver the Promising Project**? How, if at all, has it informed how you have managed the implementation of the Promising Project? *Probe for examples*
9. Have you **used any knowledge gained** from the training in any other ways?
10. What, if anything, could have been **improved** about the training?

D: Promising Projects: Preparation

Researcher note: Participating schools received matched funding to deliver one out of a choice of eight Promising Projects. The Promising Projects on offer are evidence-based programmes that have been evaluated by the EEF and shown to have significantly improved progress and closed gaps, particularly for disadvantaged children. The training to deliver a Promising Project was normally delivered to teachers and TAs but a member of SLT may have attended an initial or limited number of sessions

Begin this section by confirming which Promising Project the school is doing and which funding round they were in: Jan 2020, June-October 2020.

11. What was the specific **area for improvement** you hoped to tackle through this Promising Project?
12. **How did you identify** this improvement priority?
 - a. What, if any, information and data sources were gathered? *Probe: national test data, internal test data, lesson observations, Ofsted data, surveys/interviews with staff, pupils, parents*
 - b. How did you interpret this data? What was the process? Who was involved?
13. **Why did you select this Promising Project as a means to meet this priority/challenge?**
Explore consideration of:
 - a. Strength of evidence
 - b. How easy to implement
 - c. Cost effectiveness
 - d. Evidence of what has worked in other similar contexts
 - e. Fit of the Promising Project in the school context
14. What **sources of information** did you use to help make the decision about which Promising Project to apply for? How useful were these? *Explore:*
 - a. Your own insights and those of others in the school
 - b. EEFective Kent prospectus
 - c. The EEF Teaching and Learning Toolkit
 - d. Research evidence
 - e. Other information
15. **Who was involved in choosing** which project to deliver? *Probe for practitioners, leaders, governors.*
16. What **effect did the current Covid-19 situation have on your decision-making?**
17. **What did you understand to be the ‘active ingredients’** in the Promising Project i.e. elements and features of the Project that are understood to be key for changes/improvements to happen?
18. How did you **prepare for the implementation of the Promising Project** after you had selected it? *Probe*
 - a. Developing an implementation/action plan? If so: what did the plan include?
 - b. Developing implementation teams – who sat on these and why? What was the role of any implementation teams?
 - c. Allocating time to prepare, implement and monitor the Promising Project
 - d. Any changes to the school’s physical environment that were required?
 - e. Putting in place any materials, resources, equipment
 - f. Changes to any other school activities (e.g. did they stop doing something else to make time/space for the Promising Project)
 - g. Communicating about the Promising Project to the school
19. How are you **monitoring** the Promising Project: *Explore:*
 - a. Are there defined implementation outcomes?
 - b. How are these assessed?
 - c. Any new monitoring or data collection processes in place to monitor how the Project is being adopted?

E: Promising Projects: The training

20. Have you attended any of the Promising Project training yourself? If yes,
 - a. How did you find this?
 - b. How many sessions did you attend and what was the focus?

21. If you didn't attend, who did and what was their feedback? How many sessions did they attend and what was the focus?
22. Overall, what have been your **school's experiences of the training**? *Tailor according to the particular Promising Project and explore views on:*
 - a. Mode (online/f2f)
 - b. Timing
 - c. Resources
 - d. Support from trainers
23. Were there any barriers to you or your colleagues taking part in the training? *Probe for time, cover, effects of Covid 19*
24. What enabled you or your colleagues to take part in the training?
25. To what extent did the training prepare **you** to support delivery of the Promising Project?
26. To what extent did the training prepare **staff** to deliver the Promising Project?
27. What, if anything, could have been **improved** about the training?
28. Did you receive any **follow up support** from the Promising Project provider following the training?
29. If so:
 - a. What support did you receive?
 - b. What form did the support take?
 - c. To what extent did the support help you to deliver the project?
 - d. Did you want any other support from the provider?

F: Promising Projects: Implementation

30. Has your school started to deliver the Promising Project?
 - a. If not, why? *Probe for delays in training, Covid disruption.*
31. What has **gone well** in relation to implementing the Promising Project?
32. What have been the **challenges**?
33. What has **enabled implementation** of the project? *Probe for: Quality of the intervention, relevance to school improvement priorities, class time ringfenced by school, staff time, support from school leadership, other follow-up support provided within the school, availability of resources required to deliver the intervention,*
34. Has anything acted as a **barrier to delivery**? *Probe for: Covid-19 disruption, quality of the intervention, relevance to school improvement priorities, pupil absence, pupil/class time not ringfenced by school, staff absences, staff time, lack of support from school leadership, availability of resources required to deliver the intervention.*
35. Have you had to make any **changes to how the project is being implemented** compared to what was intended? Why? What data/information was used to inform these changes?
36. Have you made any **additions to the Promising Project** to make it more effective? What?
37. What has been the **nature of support required by staff** to implement the project? To what extent **have you/others been able to provide this**?
38. Has delivering the Promising Project had any **unintended negative consequences**?
39. To what extent has the programme made a difference to the **learning and progress of pupils involved**?
 - a. Why/why not? *Probe for examples of evidence*
40. **Do you plan to continue delivering the Promising Project next academic year**? Why/why not?

41. Do you have **any plans to scale-up the approach** introduced to the Promising Project?
How do you intend to do this?

G: Evidence based training

Researcher note: a member or members of the SLT in participating schools attended Evidence-based training based on the EEF guidance reports, delivered by the EEF's Research School Network. They can choose between courses covering: learning behaviours and supporting students with SEND, training and retaining great teachers, characteristics of deprivation, delivering remote teaching.

It is possible the SLT member didn't attend the training themselves but another member of the SLT did. If this is the case, ask them for the thinking behind these decisions and for any feedback.

42. Did you or another member of your SLT attend the Evidence-based training delivered based on the EEF guidance reports? *If not, probe to find barriers to attendance and if so, probe for enablers.*
43. If so, **which course** did you/they attend? *Learning behaviours and supporting students with SEND, Training and retraining great teachers, Characteristics of deprivation, or Delivering remote teaching?*
44. **Why did you/they choose this course?** *Probe for addressing an area for improvement, fit with school strategies, school context*
45. Did you/they attend a **taster session**? How useful or not was this? Could anything have been improved?
46. If you/they attended the training: What were the **experiences of the training**? Explore views on
- Mode (online)
 - Timing: when the training was delivered, duration
 - Components of the training: live webinars, online discussion forums
 - Resources
 - Support from trainers from the Research Schools
47. Have you/they accessed any of the **wraparound support on offer from ELEs**? If so, explore:
- Nature of support
 - Views on usefulness
 - Could anything be improved
- If not, explore reasons for this.
48. How **useful** did you/they find the training? *Probe for whether the information was new to them, what they learned, relevance of the information*
49. How, if at all, have you/they put the **training into practice**? *Probe for examples*
50. To what extent has the training impacted your/their **confidence and ability to use research and evidence to influence practice**? *Probe for examples*
51. What, if anything, could have been **improved about the training**?

H: Current use of research and evidence

Researcher note: ask SLT for specific examples where appropriate.

52. **What does the term evidence-based practice mean to you?**
53. **How important do you think evidence-based practice is to school improvement?**
54. To what extent would you say there is an **evidence-based culture in your school**?
Why/why not? Ask for specific examples

- a. Has your involvement in EEFective Kent contributed to this?
55. To what extent is there a **culture of partnership working** with other schools at your school? *Probe for mechanisms for peer support, examples of partnership working. Ask for examples*
56. **How does your school support professional learning?** *Probe for time and budget allocated to professional learning, whether experimentation is encouraged, whether new ideas are valued. Ask for examples*

I: Outcomes

Researcher note: ask SLT for specific examples throughout this section. If the school took part in Promising Projects and Evidence-based training, clarify what programme/training is perceived to have made a difference.

If outcomes are not reported, explore perceptions around likelihood they will emerge over time.

Finally, we know it is early days, but we'd like to ask your views on outcomes to date or that you think may emerge in future.

57. Has the EEFective Kent project made **any difference to your professional skills and knowledge**? Explore:
- What have you **learnt**?
 - Has it **changed how you think about teaching and learning at all**?
 - Has it built **your skills in using research and evidence** to inform school improvement and leadership?
 - Are **you more likely to use research and evidence** in future?
58. To what extent have **you/your team applied this knowledge in your implementation of school improvement activities**?
- Are you identifying school improvement priorities differently? How?
 - Are you planning and preparing to implement improvements differently? How?
 - Is there anything different about how improvements are being implemented? How?
59. To what extent has the programme affected **staff confidence in accessing and using evidence and research** to inform practice at your school?
- Have staff **gained any new knowledge or skills**?
 - Are **staff more equipped to use research and evidence** to inform their teaching and learning?
 - Are staff **more likely to use research and evidence** to inform teaching and learning in future? Why/why not
60. Has the school developed any **new links/connections** as a result of EEFective Kent (e.g. with other schools, other education professional schools, other intermediaries)? *Explore nature of these and perceived impact*
61. In your view, has your school's involvement in EEFective Kent **changed attitudes or practice in relation to CPD opportunities**? How?
62. Do you **plan to continue delivering the Promising Project** next academic year? Why/why not?
63. Do you/your school have any plans to deliver **further evidence-based programmes or practices next academic year**? Nature of these; if Promising Projects, which ones?
64. To what extent has/will EEFective Kent made a **difference to the learning and progress of pupils** in your school?
- Why/why not? *Probe for examples of evidence*

65. Has EEFective Kent made any **other differences to your school** or informed any other changes?
66. Finally, **how effective is the collaboration between Kent County Council and EEF in engaging schools in the programme?**
- a. What, if anything, could Kent County Council and EEF do better facilitate your participation in the programme?
67. **To what extent is EEFective Kent an appropriate model** to promote evidence-based practice in schools?

Thank you for your time, is there anything else you'd like to add?

Appendix A7: Case study research with schools topic guide: Teaching staff guide

EEFective Kent – Teaching staff Topic Guide

Thank you for agreeing to take part in an interview about EEFective Kent.

I work for IES, an independent, not-for-profit, research organisation. We have been appointed by the Education Endowment Foundation, with support from Kent County Council, to carry out the evaluation of EEFective Kent. The evaluation will aim to understand whether the project has helped to increase the uptake of evidence-based programmes in Kent schools and has supported collaborative working between schools. Learning and insights from the evaluation will be used to help develop the project and also to inform future initiatives. Our discussion today will cover details of your involvement in the project, focusing on delivery of a Promising Project, and your views on progress to date.

Participation is voluntary and you can stop at any time. If you do not want to answer a question, let me know and we can move on.

Before we begin, I want to run through some general information with you:

- Everything discussed in the interview is confidential and will only be used for the purposes of this research.
- We will write a report based on our findings for EEF. The information you share today will be anonymised in the report. It means that we will talk about the main themes that came out of all the discussions we have had with stakeholders but will not identify anyone. Please feel free to answer the questions as openly and honestly as possible
- With your permission I would like to record the interview – I'll be taking notes as we talk but it helps to have a back-up. The recording will be stored securely and will only be accessible to the IES team. It will be deleted 6 months after the end of the project.

Do you have any questions before we start?

A: Background

1. Can you tell me a bit about your **role in the school and your responsibilities** in relation to the Promising Projects programme? *Probe: How long have they been in the role*
2. Can you tell me about **your school**? *Probe: Location, key challenges facing the school, size,*

B: Use of research and evidence

I'd like to start by asking a few questions about the use of research and professional learning in your school generally.

3. What does the term evidence-based practice mean to you?
4. How important do you think evidence-based practice is to school improvement?
5. To what extent is there a culture that supports the use of evidence at your school? *Why/why not? Probe for the following and ask for examples:*

- a. Is there an expectation of using data, research and evidence to inform teaching and learning from leaders?
 - b. What messages, if any, are there from school leaders about the use of research and evidence?
 - c. Is there a research/evidence 'go to' person?
 - d. Has your involvement in EEFective Kent contributed to this?
6. Do you feel you have the skills/knowledge you need to use evidence to inform practice and are supported in this?
7. Have you previously delivered an evidence informed intervention at your school?
a. If so: Can you tell me a bit about the intervention and your experience of delivery?
8. To what extent is there a culture of partnership working with other schools at your school?
Probe for mechanisms for peer support, support from leadership for partnership working.
9. How does your school support professional learning? *Probe for*
- a. whether there is an expectation to take part in CPD
 - b. time and budget allocated to professional learning
 - c. whether experimentation is encouraged
 - d. whether new ideas are valued

C: Promising Projects training

Researcher note: Begin this section by confirming which Promising Project the school is doing and which funding round they were in: Jan 2020, June-October 2020

10. **How did you find out about the opportunity** to be involved in *name of project/the Promising Project*? What did you think?
11. **Why did your school choose to apply for the Promising Project** that you are delivering?
- a. Who was involved in choosing which project to deliver? *Probe for interviewee's role, other practitioners, leaders, governors.*
 - b. To what extent did the match funding contribute to the decision to take part?
12. What **issues/improvement priorities in the school** was the Promising Project intended to address?
13. Can you tell me a bit about your **experience of the Promising Projects training**? *Probe for*
- a. How was the training delivered? *Probe for balance of taught sessions, self-guided learning, one to one support, other support from trainers*
 - b. How accessible was the training?
 - c. What did the training cover?
 - d. Quality of the training?
14. Were there any **barriers** to attending the training? *Probe for time, cover, leadership support, support from other colleagues*
15. **What enabled you to participate** effectively in the training? *Probe for time, cover, leadership support, support from other colleagues*
16. **To what extent did the training prepare you to deliver the Promising Project**? How confident/not did you feel after the training about being able to deliver the project in your school?
17. What, if anything, could have been **improved** about the training?
18. Did you receive any **follow up support** from the Promising Project provider following the training?
19. If so:

- b. What support did you receive?
- c. What form did the support take?
- d. To what extent did the support help you to deliver the project?
- e. What, if any, additional support would you have benefitted from?

D: Promising Projects implementation

20. **Have you started delivering the Promising Project** in your school?
- f. If not, why? *Probe for delays in training, Covid disruption, lack of support from the school, staff absence*
21. **Who in the school is involved** in the implementation of the Promising Project? What role do they play? How do you work with them?
22. What did you think of the Promising Project overall? What did you **like/dislike** about it?
23. What has **gone well** in relation to delivering the Promising Project so far?
24. What have been the **challenges** so far?
25. **What has enabled implementation** of the project? *Probe for:*
- g. Internal factors: *Relevance to school improvement priorities, class time ringfenced by school, staff time, support from school leadership*
 - h. External factors: *Quality of the intervention, availability of resources, support from trainers/Promising Project provider*
26. Has anything acted as a **barrier** to delivery? Probe for:
- i. Internal factors: *relevance to school improvement priorities, pupil absence, pupil/class time not ringfenced by school, staff absences, staff time, lack of support from school leadership*
 - j. External factors: *Covid-19 disruption, quality of the intervention, availability of resources required to deliver the intervention*
27. Have you had to make any **changes** to how the Promising Project is being implemented compared to what was intended? Why?
28. Has delivering the Promising Project had any **unintended negative consequences**?
29. **Is delivery of the project monitored**? How? *Explore: any data collected and how analysed, feedback to/from other staff, pupils*

E: Outcomes

30. To what extent has the Promising Project made a **difference to the learning and progress of pupils** involved?
- k. Why/why not? *Probe for examples of evidence*
31. Has the Promising Project made **any difference to your professional skills and knowledge**? Explore:
- a. What have you **learnt**?
 - b. Has it **changed how you think about teaching and learning at all**?
 - c. Has it built **your skills in using research and evidence** to inform your teaching practice? Are **you more likely to use research and evidence** in future?
 - d. Have you developed any **new links/connections** as a result of the Promising Project (e.g. with other schools, other education professional schools, other intermediaries)
32. Has the Promising Project made any **other differences to your school** or informed any other changes?
- a. Has the Promising Project affected the **school's engagement with research and evidence**?

- b. Is the school **more likely to use research and evidence** to inform teaching and learning in future? Why/why not
 - c. Changes in relation to CPD- **attitudes or offer of CPD**?
 - d. Changes in relation to **knowledge exchange**?
33. Do you **plan to continue** delivering the Promising Project next academic year? Why/why not?
34. Do you/your school have any plans to deliver further evidence-based interventions next academic year? Nature of these; if Promising Projects, which ones?

Thank you for your time, is there anything else you'd like to add?

Appendix A8: Case study research with schools: Evidence Champions topic guide

EEFective Kent – Evidence Champions Topic Guide

Thank you for agreeing to take part in an interview about EEFective Kent. I work for IES, or the Institute for Employment Studies and we are an independent, not-for-profit research organisation. We have been appointed by the Education Endowment Foundations, with support from Kent County Council, to carry out the evaluation of evidence-based programmes in Kent schools. Learning and insights from the evaluation will be used to help develop the project and also to inform future initiatives.

Our discussion today will cover details of your role as an Evidence Champion and how Evidence Based Research is utilised within your school.

Participation is completely voluntary, and you can stop at any time. If you do not want to answer a question, let me know and we can move on.

Before we begin, I want to run through some general points.

- Everything discussed in the interview is confidential and will only be used for the purposes of this research.
- We will write a report based on our findings for EEF. The information you share today will be anonymised in the report. It means that we will talk about the main themes that came out of all the discussions we have had with stakeholders but will not identify anyone. Please feel free to answer the questions as openly and honestly as possible.
- With your permission, I would like to record the interview. I will be taking notes as we talk but it helps to have a back-up to refer to. The recording will be stored securely and will only be accessible to the IES team. It will be deleted 6 months after the end of the project.

Do you have any questions before we start?

Is it okay to go ahead with recording?

Researchers note: Check what projects the school may have been on before interviewing. May help for context or inform where/why they started as an EC.

Background

1. Can you tell me about your role in the school and your responsibilities as an Evidence Champion?
2. Can you tell me about your school? Probe: location, key challenges, size, FSM and pupil premium.

3. Has your school taken part in any other EEFective Kent projects? If so, which ones (EBT/PP)?
4. What information did you receive about the Evidence Champion course?

Role as an Evidence Champion

5. Can I just check, when did you do the EC training? (**Researcher note: check recruitment spreadsheet and confirm whether: Cohort 1 February 22,- Cohort 2 from October 2022-March 2023, Cohort 3 June-July 2023**)
 - a. Why did your school need an Evidence Champion?
 - b. Why did you become an Evidence Champion?
 - i. *Probe for: nominated by headteacher/SLT, nominated themselves,*
 - c. Was this something you wanted to do?
 - d. How big a factor was the 50% subsidy in taking part in the training?
6. Did you already have prior knowledge of evidence based research in regard to education improvements?
 - a. *Examples of use of Evidence and Research prior to being an EC.*
7. What did you hope to achieve as an EC?

Evidence Champion Training

8. How did you become an Evidence Champion?
 - a. *Probe for: what they did once selected i.e., signing up process, attending sessions etc.*
9. How was the sign up and registration process? Did you receive enough information? Was there anything else you would have liked?

Online sessions (**Cohort 1** – February 22, **Cohort 2** - 18/10/22, 6/12/22, 31/1/23, **Cohort 3** – June 2023)

 - a. How accessible did you find the training? (Length of sessions – 2 hours?)
 - b. How useful did you find the training?
 - c. Was the information new to you?
- d. What did the training consist of?
 - e. Did you receive any resources?
 - f. What session was most useful for you? Why?
10. Did you create an implementation plan?
 - a. **If yes**, what was included?
 - b. **If no**, why not?

11. **[If in Cohort 2]** Did you attend the face-to-face networking session in March?
a. Did you make any links/connections?

12. Could the training be improved? If yes, how?

Advising and supporting other staff

13. How has being an Evidence Champion worked in practice in your school?

- a. How have you been working with colleagues? *Probe for: Signposting to resources, other involvement in finding research and evidence*
- b. Has your role as an EC enabled you to contribute towards school improvements?
- c. Evaluating existing policies and procedures in school?
- d. Dissemination of research and evidence?

14. What sorts of other activities have you been doing as an Evidence Champion?

15. Have you encountered any difficulties in your role as Evidence Champion? *If yes, tell me more.*

- a. Do you have additional time for the EC role?
- b. Have you been given a TLR (Teaching and Learning Responsibility) payment of any kind
- c. Have you progressed in your role or taken on any additional responsibilities?

Outcomes/Impact

8. Has being an Evidence Champion made any difference to your professional skills and knowledge

- a. What have you learnt?
- b. Has it changed how you think about teaching and learning?
- c. Has it built your skills or changed your views on using research and evidence to inform school improvements?
- d. Are you more likely to use research and evidence in the future, now?

9. To what extent has being an EC affected staff confidence in accessing and using evidence and research?

- a. Have staff gained any new skills?
- b. Are they more equipped to use research and evidence?
- c. More likely to use evidence and research?

10. Have your relationships with other staff changed since you became an Evidence Champion?

- a. Has your status improved?

- b. do you feel more respected?
- c. asked for more advice?
- d. more responsibility?
- e. Have there been any challenges or conflicts?
- f. What is the biggest change you've noticed from becoming an EC?

11. How has being an Evidence Champion impacted...

- a. You? *Probe for: increased workload,*
- b. Other staff: *Probe for: greater use of evidence and research, sharing evidence and research, increased understanding/interest*
- c. School Improvement Plans
- d. What has been the biggest impact of you becoming an Evidence Champion?

12. Has being an Evidence Champion changed:

- a. How your school identifies improvement priorities?
- b. How your school implements improvements?
- c. Anything else in the school?

13. Has being an Evidence Champion made any other differences to your school

- a. Informed any other changes?

14. What impacts did you anticipate in your school by becoming an Evidence Champion?

- a. Have these materialised?

15. Do you think there is a demand or need for Evidence Champions or something similar?

- a. **If Yes**, do you feel being an EC has met these demands
- b. **If No**, do you feel Evidence Champions benefit...
 - i. Schools
 - ii. Other staff
 - iii. Individuals (career progression etc.)
 - iv. Pupil improvements

Sustainability

16. What do you see the role of Evidence Champions to be going forward?

17. How will the EC role work in your school...
- In the next academic year?
 - Beyond the next academic year?
18. How do you and your school plan to
- continue supporting evidence-based research
 - Sharing evidence-based research with colleagues
 - Build an evidence-based culture in your school?
 - What would help you and your school continue to focus on evidence-based research? Are there any barriers to your school continuing to engage with evidence-based research?
19. Finally, how effective has the collaboration between Kent County Council and EEF been in engaging schools in the programme?
20. What, if anything, could Kent County Council and EEF do better to facilitate your participation in the programme or similar programmes in the future?
21. To what extent is EEFective Kent an appropriate model to promote evidence-based practice in schools?

Thank you for your time, is there anything else you'd like to add, anything you want to make sure is fed-back about being an EC?

Case study prompting and recontact permissions

As part of the next wave of research, we are hoping to recruit some schools to be Evidence Champion case studies, where we would interview someone like yourself and other staff members who may have spoken to you or started using more research and evidence as a result of you being an EC.

Would this be something possible or of interest to you and others in your school?

It could take the format of a group interview over Teams like this or shorter individual interviews with staff who might be interested.

Would it be okay to send over an email with further information/details to yourself

Appendix A9: Endline survey

Introduction

Thank you very much for taking part in this survey.

Your responses will contribute to the evaluation carried out by the Institute for Employment Studies (IES) as part of Kent County Council's and the Education Endowment Foundation's EEfective Kent Project. The EEfective Kent Project aims to improve educational outcomes for children across Kent. In support of this aim, the survey explores different approaches to support pupil progress, including how decisions to introduce new approaches are made.

We are interested in hearing from all schools in Kent, whether you are taking part in the EEfective Kent Project or not. Your views and experiences matter. To say thank you for the time you are giving to complete the survey, participating schools will be entered in a prize draw when the survey closes. The 5 selected schools will be awarded £200 cash each*.

The survey should take around 10-15 minutes to complete. Your answers will be treated confidentially, which means that you and your school will not be identified in any reports produced from this research. Your personal details and responses will not be shared with anyone outside the IES research team and no one within your school, Kent County Council or the Education Endowment Foundation will be able to see your answers. Further details about how data is used in this research can be found in the [privacy notice](#).

*Each school can only be entered once in the prize draw.

Background

What is your school's name?

What is your School's Unique Reference Number (URN)?

Q1 What is your job role? (Please tick one box below that best describes your role)

1. Headteacher /principal
2. Other senior manager / leader (e.g. director, deputy or assistant headteacher)
3. Middle leader (e.g. head of department, subject or curriculum area leader, key stage leader, pastoral services leader)
4. Classroom teacher
5. Support staff / teaching assistant
6. School manager / bursar
7. Research lead
8. Other role (please specify if you have classroom responsibilities in addition to your role)

Q2 How long have you been in the teaching profession? (Please tick the box that describes the length of your whole teaching career, including career breaks)

1. 30 years or more
2. 20-29 years
3. 10-19 years
4. 5-9 years
5. 1-4 years
6. First year of teaching (NQT)

Your general approach to teaching and learning to support pupils' progress

[if answered 1, 2, 3, 6,7,8 to Q1= not class teacher or TA/support staff]

We would like you to think broadly about how your school develops teaching to support pupil progress

Q3 To what extent does your school consult the following sources when identifying areas for improvement to support pupil progress? (Please tick one box in each row)

	A lot	Some/ a little	Not at all	N/A
National test data				
Internal test data				
Lesson observation data				
OFSTED				
Surveys / interviews				
Reviews, feedback or data from local authority / The Education People				

[if answered 1, 2, 3, 6,7,8 to Q1= not class teacher or TA/support staff]

Q4 To what extent does your school consult the following sources when deciding how to address school improvement issues that have been identified? (Please tick one box in each row)

	A lot	Some/ a little	Not at all	N/A
Reviews, feedback or data from local authority/ The Education People,				
Academy chains/multi-academy trusts, including their experts				
Private sector organisations (commercial, specialists, educational consultancies)				
The Chartered College of Teaching				
Other school networks (e.g. teaching schools alliances, maths hubs)				
Articles, reports, books or summaries based on academic research				

Articles, reports, books or summaries based on teacher experience				
Information gathered through training / CPD				
Education Endowment Foundation Teaching and Learning Toolkit/website				
The Research Schools network				
Online evidence platforms or databases eg NFER, CUREE				
ResearchEd events				
National Leaders of Education and / or Kent Leaders of Education				
Mentors (in my school or another school)				
Guidance from exam boards				
Colleagues within the school				
Colleagues in other schools				
Media (eg TES, Schools Weekly)				
Social media (Twitter, blogs)				

[Ask all]

Q5 When deciding on approaches to support pupil progress, what factors affect your decisions? (Please rate the level of influence that each of the following factors has on your decisions about adopting approaches to support pupil progress)

	Strong influence	Some influence	No influence	N/A
How straightforward an approach is to implement				
How popular an approach is likely to be with staff				
How popular an approach is likely to be with parents				
How popular an approach is likely to be with pupils				
How inexpensive an approach is				

Whether an approach is backed by academic research				
Whether an approach is a good fit with existing practices				
Whether an approach is aligned with your professional experience				
Whether an approach has been used by other schools in your network with positive feedback				

[Ask all]

Q6 How (if at all) do you use research information in your work? By 'research' we mean information from books, reports, articles, summaries, training or events that is based on academic studies. (Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	N/A
Information from research plays an important role in informing my/our teaching practice						
I believe that using information from research will help to improve pupil outcomes						
I know where to find relevant research that may help to inform teaching methods/practice						
My school leaders/governors encourage me to use information from research to improve my practice						
I am able to relate information from research to my context						
Other staff in my school use information from research to inform their teaching practice						
I find it easy to understand information from research						
I feel confident about analysing information from research						

Information from research conducted elsewhere is of value to our school						
I use information from research to help me to decide how to implement new approaches in the classroom						

[if answered 1, 2, 3, 6,7,8 to Q1= not class teacher or TA/support staff]

Q7 Which (if any) of the following measures has your school focused on over the last two years to support pupil progress? (Please tick as many boxes as applicable).

	Yes, implemented in last 2 years	Yes, plan to implement this year
Improving feedback between teachers and pupils		
More teaching of metacognition and self-regulation strategies		
Improving teaching of reading comprehension strategies		
Using mastery learning approaches		
Using collaborative learning approaches		
Early years interventions		
One to one tuition		
Oral language interventions		
Peer-to-peer tutoring schemes for pupils		
Improving approach to homework		
Other (please specify)		

[if answered 1, 2, 3, 6,7,8 to Q1= not class teacher or TA/support staff]

Q8 Which, if any, of the following were important in identifying the measure(s) you named above? (Please tick all that apply)

1. Ideas generated by me or my school
2. Ideas from other schools
3. Advice from my academy chain, local authority or The Education People
4. Articles, reports, books or summaries based on academic research (paper or web)

5. based)
6. Articles, reports, books or summaries based on teacher experience (paper or web based)
7. The promotional materials of an external supplier
8. Action research conducted by me or my colleagues
9. Information gathered through training/CPD
10. Online evidence platforms or databases (e.g. the Education Endowment Foundation Teaching and Learning Toolkit)
11. Guidance from official bodies such as DfE and Ofsted
12. Guidance from exam boards
13. Don't know
14. Other (please specify)

Supporting professional learning

[Ask all]

Q9 How does your school environment support professional learning? (Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	N/A
My school facilitates a professional learning community						
My school has formal processes to help staff critically engage with information sources						
My school makes time available for staff to use a variety of information sources						
My school allocates budget to professional learning activities for its staff						
My school has a research lead i.e. a 'go to' person to help with access to research						
My school encourages experimentation with different approaches to teaching						

My school values the introduction of new ideas about teaching and learning						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Working with other schools

[Ask all]

Q10 This question aims to find out about how (if at all) you work with other schools in Kent. (Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	N/A
My school has good processes/structures in place to support collaborative working with other schools						
My school works in partnership with other schools to jointly develop practice through mutual support and challenge						
My school has developed its capacity for self-evaluation through peer-to-peer work						
The partnerships in which my school has been involved have been mutually beneficial for all participating schools						
The partnerships my school is currently involved in are likely to be sustained						
There are good arrangements in place in Kent to support collaboration between schools						

[if answered 4, 5 to Q1= class teacher or TA/support staff] - go to penultimate page

[if answered 1, 2, 3, 6,7,8 to Q1= not class teacher or TA/support staff]

Participating in the Promising Projects

Q11 Has your school used any of the following programmes (from the EEF's Promising Projects list) in the last two years? (Please tick as many boxes as applicable)

	Yes, implemented in last 2 years	Yes, plan to implement next academic year
1stClass@Number		
app-based maths learning (onebillion)		
Children's University		
Embedding Formative Assessment		
Mathematical Reasoning		
Nuffield Early Language Intervention		
Philosophy for Children		
Accelerated Reader		
ReflectED Metacognition		
Reciprocal Reading		
Stop and Think: Learning Counterintuitive Concepts		
Switch-on Reading		
Thinking, Doing, Talking Science		
Improving Working Memory / Working Memory Plus		
Other [Please specify]		
Don't know		
None		

Don't know

None (**IF Q11 = none go to Q14**)

Other [Please specify]

IF Q11 = yes

Q12 Why did you apply for a Promising Project as part of the EEFective Kent Project? (Please select all that apply)

1. The programmes that our school applied for are supported by robust evidence
2. The programmes that our school applied for are clearly described
3. The programmes that our school applied for are appropriate to my school's needs
4. The funding has allowed our school to implement programmes we were previously interested in
5. Our school was already planning to implement a Promising Project this year, so it made sense to access this funding
6. The application process was straightforward and simple
7. The matched funding was a strong incentive
8. The contribution required was equal to or less than the budget our school usually spends on programmes
9. Other schools we work with share the same interest in the programmes that I applied for
10. Our school wasn't aware of the intervention(s) until we heard about it through the EEFective Kent programme
11. Other (please specify)

Q13 Where did you hear about the Promising Projects strand of EEFective Kent Project? (Please select all that apply)

1. KELSI website
2. KELSI newsletter
3. Headteacher briefings
4. Promising Projects Roadshow (virtual or face-to-face)
5. Social Media (Facebook/Twitter/Linked in)
6. The Education People
7. Kent Association of Headteachers
8. Local Inclusion Forum Team (LIFT)
9. ResearchEd event
10. Education Endowment Foundation website
11. Governors
12. Other (please specify)

Now go to Q15

None (so no PP done or planned)

Q14 Why have you not applied? (Please select all that apply)

1. We are unaware of the EEFective Kent Project / Promising Projects strand of EEFective Kent
2. None of the programmes are appropriate to the school's needs
3. The funding was not sufficient
4. The school's contribution was too high
5. Our school was unaware of the matched-funding opportunities

6. The application process was too complicated
7. Lack of time and capacity to apply
8. The school does not have the capacity to deliver the programmes
9. Insufficient interest in the programmes offered among school leadership
10. Our school had previously done all the Promising Project interventions that were appropriate to our needs
11. Other please specify

NOW GO to Q23

IF Q11 = yes

Q15 Did you access the EEF's training on Putting Evidence to Work: A School's Guide to implementation? You may have done this training online or face-to-face. (This is also known as Online Implementation Training).

This training is about evidence-informed school improvement and introduces a cycle with 5 steps: 1. Decide what you want to achieve. 2. Identify possible solutions and strategies. 3. Give the idea the best chance of success. 4. Did it work? 5. Secure and spread change.

1. Yes (go to Q16)
2. No (go to Q17)
3. Don't know (go to Q18)

Q16 Please indicate the extent to which you either agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I found the 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training useful					
I would recommend the 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training to other school leaders					
The 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training was relevant to the issues and context of my organisation					
The 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training helped me to target a realistic priority to target through new training					

The implementation training helped me to identify which Promising Projects Training Course(s) to apply for					
I intend to apply the approach described in the 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training in future to identify further school improvement priorities					

[If no to Q15 did not access the EEF's training on Putting Evidence to Work]:

Q17 Why did you not access the EEF's training on Putting Evidence to Work: A School's Guide to implementation?

1. I was unaware of the availability of the training
2. The training was not appropriate to my needs
3. The training was not appropriate to my school's needs
4. I did not like the online mode of access
5. Lack of time and capacity to do the training
6. I have done the training previous
7. Other (please specify) open text response

If Q11=yes

Impact of promising projects

Q18 Does your school intend to continue implementing the Promising Project that you accessed through the EEFective Kent project?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

If No: Why not? [open text]

Q19 Does your school intend to fund any other EEF Promising Project approaches in the 23/24 academic year as part of its approach to CPD and school improvement?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

Q20 As a result of taking part in a Promising Project, has partnership working improved in your school?

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree

4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

Q21 As a result of taking part in a Promising Project, have any new partnerships been formed?

1. Partnerships with training organisations
2. Partnerships within MAT
3. Partnerships outside of MAT
4. Partnerships with other schools
5. Other partnerships (Please specify) [Open text]

Q22 As a result of taking part in a Promising Project, do you feel there have been improvements in pupil attainment and/or progress?

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

ALL

Participating in Evidence-Based Training (EBT)

Q23 Has your school used any of the following programmes (from the EEF's Evidence Based Training list) in the last two years? (Please tick as many boxes as applicable)

	Yes, implemented in last 2 years	Yes, plan to implement next academic year
Characteristics of Deprivation		
Delivery of Remote Learning		
SEND and Learning Behaviours		
Training and Retaining Great Teachers		
Evidence Informed Curriculum Development		
Improving Memory and Metacognition		
Tackling Educational Disadvantage		
Effective Learning Behaviours		
From Mitigation to Success		

Designing Effective Professional Development		
Evidence Champions Training		
Other [Please specify]		
Don't know		
None		

If none to Q23 – go to penultimate page

If yes to Q23

Q24 Why did you apply for a Evidence-Based Training course? (Please select all that apply)

1. The course was supported by robust evidence
2. The course was clearly described
3. The course that our school applied for was appropriate to my school's needs
4. The funding has allowed our school to tackle areas we were previously interested in
5. Our school was already planning to access CPD in this area, so it made sense to access this funding
6. The application process was straightforward and simple
7. The matched funding was a strong incentive
8. The contribution required was equal to or less than the budget our school usually spends on CPD
9. Other schools we work with share the same interest in the courses that I applied for
10. Other (please specify)

Q25 Where did you hear about the Evidence-Based Training strand of EEFective Kent Project? (Please select all that apply)

1. KELSI website
2. KELSI newsletter
3. Headteacher briefings
4. Social Media (Facebook/Twitter/Linked in)
5. The Education People
6. Kent Association of Headteachers
7. Local Inclusion Forum Team (LIFT)
8. ResearchEd event
9. Education Endowment Foundation website
10. Governors
11. Other (please specify)

Do not ask this set of questions if answered Qs15-17

Q26 Did you access the EEF's training on Putting Evidence to Work: A School's Guide to implementation? You may have done this training online or face-to-face. (This is also known as Online Implementation Training).

This training is about evidence-informed school improvement and introduces a cycle with 5 steps: 1. Decide what you want to achieve. 2. Identify possible solutions and strategies. 3. Give the idea the best chance of success. 4. Did it work? 5. Secure and spread change.

1. Yes (go to Q27)
2. No (go to Q28)
3. Don't know (Go to Q29)

Q27 Please indicate the extent to which you either agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I found the 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training useful					
I would recommend the 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training to other school leaders					
The 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training was relevant to the issues and context of my organisation					
The 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training helped me to target a realistic priority to target through new training					
The implementation training helped me to identify which Promising Projects Training Course(s) to apply for					
I intend to apply the approach described in the 'Putting Evidence to Work' implementation training in future to identify further school improvement priorities					

Now go to Q29

[If no to Q26 did not access the EEF's training on Putting Evidence to Work]:

Q28 Why did you not access the EEF's training on Putting Evidence to Work: A School's Guide to implementation?

1. I was unaware of the availability of the training

2. The training was not appropriate to my needs
3. The training was not appropriate to my school's needs
4. I did not like the online mode of access
5. Lack of time and capacity to do the training
6. I have done the training previous
7. Other (please specify) open text response

Impact of Evidence-Based Training (EBT)

Q29 As a result of the Evidence-Based Training offered through the EEFective Kent project, has your school **implemented** new **evidence-based practices**?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

If yes: Please briefly describe the new practices you have introduced as a result of the Evidence-Based Training

Open text: 600 characters

Now go to Q31

If No: Why not? [open text]

If No to Q30

Q30 As a result of the Evidence-Based Training offered through the EEFective Kent project, does your school **intend** to implement new **evidence-based practices**?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

If yes: Please briefly describe the new practices you have intend to implement as a result of the Evidence-Based Training

Open text: 600 characters

Now go to Q31

If No: Why not? [open text]

Then go to Q31

Q31 As a result of the Evidence-Base Training offered through the EEFective Kent project, has your school devised an **evidence-informed strategy** for an aspect of school improvement:

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

If yes: Please briefly describe the evidence informed strategy you have introduced as a result of the Evidence-Based Training

Open text: 600 characters

Then go to Q33

If No: Why not? [open text]

If answered No to Q31:

Q32 As a result of the Evidence-Base Training offered through the EEFective Kent project, does your school **intend** to devise an evidence-informed strategy for an aspect of school improvement?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

If Yes: What does your school intend to do? [Open Text]

Q33 Does your school intend to continue implementing the Evidence-Based Training project that you accessed through the EEFective Kent project?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

If No, why not: [open text]

Q34 Does your school intend to fund any other EEF Evidence-Based Training approaches in the 23/24 academic year as part of its approach to CPD and school improvement?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

Q35 As a result of taking part in Evidence-Based Training, has partnership working improved in your school?

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

Q36 As a result of taking part in an Evidence-Based Training course, have any new partnerships been formed?

1. Partnerships with training organisations
2. Partnerships within MAT
3. Partnerships outside of MAT
4. Partnerships with other schools
5. Other partnerships (Please specify) [Open text]

Q37 As a result of taking part in the EEFective Kent project, do you feel more confident about using research and evidence to inform school improvement activities?

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

*Please can you provide your **email address** (text box)*

This is the end of the survey, please press submit

Appendix A10: Baseline survey analysis

Table 1: Respondent job role

	Frequency	Percent
Classroom teacher	1	1%
Headteacher / principal	111	73%
Middle leader	8	5%
Other role	3	2%
Other senior manager / leader	30	20%
Total	153	

Table 2: Respondent length of time in profession

	Frequency	Percent
1-4 years	4	3%
5-9 years	8	5%
10-19 years	43	28%
20-29 years	75	49%
30 years or more	22	14%
Total	152	100%

Table 3: Extent that schools consult the following sources when identifying areas for improvement to support pupil progress (Frequency)

	A lot	Some/ a little	Not at all	N/A
National test data	97	49	5	
Internal test data	121	26	4	
Lesson observation data	102	45	3	1
OFSTED	55	80	14	2
Surveys / interviews	49	99	3	
Reviews, feedback or data from local authority / The Education People	51	86	11	1

Base: 152

Table 4: Extent that schools consult the following sources when deciding how to address school improvement issues that have been identified? (Frequency)

	A lot	Some/ a little	Not at all	N/A
The Chartered College of Teaching	10	47	84	10
Academy chains/multi-academy trusts, including their experts	24	36	49	43
Guidance from exam boards	20	41	55	35
The Research Schools network	7	57	80	6
ResearchEd events	12	58	76	6
Private sector organisations (commercial, specialists, educational consultancies)	9	84	50	9
National Leaders of Education and / or Kent Leaders of Education	18	88	42	3
Online evidence platforms or databases e.g. NFER, CUREE	15	92	42	3
Social media (Twitter, blogs)	21	89	37	5
Media (e.g. TES, Schools Weekly)	11	110	29	1
Mentors (in my school or another school)	32	93	22	5

Education Endowment Foundation Teaching and Learning Toolkit/website	71	68	11	2
Articles, reports, books or summaries based on teacher experience	45	97	10	
Reviews, feedback or data from local authority/ The Education People,	53	89	7	3
Colleagues in other schools	57	89	5	
Articles, reports, books or summaries based on academic research	57	90	5	
Other school networks (e.g. teaching schools alliances, maths hubs)	60	87	5	
Information gathered through training / CPD	93	56	3	
Colleagues within the school	100	50	2	

Base: 152

Table 5: When deciding on approaches to support pupil progress, what factors affect your decisions? (Frequency)

	Strong influence	Some influence	No influence
Whether an approach is a good fit with existing practices	97	55	1
Whether an approach is backed by academic research	100	51	2
How straightforward an approach is to implement	73	77	3
How popular an approach is likely to be with pupils	47	102	4
Whether an approach has been used by other schools in your network with positive feedback	73	73	7
How inexpensive an approach is	46	99	8
Whether an approach is aligned with your professional experience	53	90	8
How popular an approach is likely to be with staff	32	107	14
How popular an approach is likely to be with parents	12	112	23

Base: 152

Table 6: How, if at all, do you use research information in your work? (Frequency)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	N/A
My school leaders/governors encourage me to use information from research to improve my practice	37	68	35	9	1	2
Other staff in my school use information from research to inform their teaching practice	33	94	18	8		
I feel confident about analysing information from research	43	84	23	3		
I use information from research to help me to decide how to implement new approaches in the classroom	45	89	13	1	1	4
Information from research conducted elsewhere is of value to our school	49	86	18			
I find it easy to understand information from research	41	95	16	1		
I know where to find relevant research that may help to inform teaching methods/practice	47	90	10	4		2
Information from research plays an important role in informing my/our teaching practice	66	77	8	1		1
I am able to relate information from research to my context	51	92	7	2		1
I believe that using information from research will help to improve pupil outcomes	72	75	6			

Base: 152

Table 7: Baseline survey – Which, if any, of the following measures has your school focused on over the last two years to support pupil progress? (Frequency)

	Yes, implemented in last 2 years	Yes, plan to implement this year	N/A
Improving feedback between teachers and pupils	138	14	1
Using mastery learning approaches	129	14	4
Improving teaching of reading comprehension strategies	123	23	7
Using collaborative learning approaches	106	16	20
More teaching of metacognition and self-regulation strategies	105	36	8
Early years interventions	76	30	31
Oral language interventions	74	39	26
Improving approach to homework	72	34	30
One to one tuition	59	42	41
Peer-to-peer tutoring schemes for pupils	37	36	63
Other (please specify)	12	3	64

Base: 152

Table 8: Which, if any, of the following were important in identifying the measures named in Table A9.12?

	Frequency	Percent
Ideas generated by me or my school	134	88%
Information gathered through training/CPD	131	86%
Ideas from other schools	123	80%
Articles, reports, books or summaries based on academic research (paper or web based)	109	71%
Online evidence platforms or databases (e.g. the Education Endowment Foundation Teaching and Learning Toolkit)	106	69%
Action research conducted by me or my colleagues	88	58%
Guidance from official bodies such as DfE and Ofsted	87	57%
Advice from my academy chain, local authority or The Education People	63	41%
Guidance from exam boards	18	12%
The promotional materials of an external supplier	16	10%
Other (please specify)	2	1%
Don't know		0%

Base: 152

Table 9: Has your school used any of the following programmes from the EEF's Promising Projects list in the last two years? (Frequency)

	Yes, implemented in last 2 years	Yes, plan to implement this year	Don't know	Total 'Yes'
Accelerated Reader	47	10	29	57
Nuffield Early Language Intervention	14	32	38	46
Embedding Formative Assessment	29	12	35	41
Mathematical Reasoning	34	6	31	40
Improving Working Memory / Working Memory Plus	12	15	37	27
Reciprocal Reading	21	5	41	26
Philosophy for Children	16	3	45	19
Switch-on Reading	8	8	44	16

app-based maths learning (onebillion)	7	7	43	14
ReflectED Metacognition	6	8	42	14
1stClass@Number	9	1	45	10
Children's University	8	2	46	10
Thinking, Doing, Talking Science	1	4	45	5
Stop and Think: Learning Counterintuitive Concepts			48	0

Base: 152

Table 10: How does your school support professional learning?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	N/A
My school values the introduction of new ideas about teaching and learning	75	76	2			
My school facilitates a professional learning community	68	76	5	4		
My school allocates budget to professional learning activities for its staff	63	76	9	4	1	
My school encourages experimentation with different approaches to teaching	52	87	10	3		1
My school makes time available for staff to use a variety of information sources	31	94	21	6	1	
My school has formal processes to help staff critically engage with information sources	25	78	38	11		1
My school has a research lead i.e. a 'go to' person to help with access to research	18	36	41	48	3	4

Base: 153

Table 11: How do you work with other schools in Kent? (Frequency)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	N/A
My school has good processes/structures in place to support collaborative working with other schools	67	64	13	5	1	
The partnerships in which my school has been involved have been mutually beneficial for all participating schools	56	70	18	3		3
The partnerships my school is currently involved in are likely to be sustained	59	63	24	1		3
My school works in partnership with other schools to jointly develop practice through mutual support and challenge	58	62	22	7	1	
My school has developed its capacity for self-evaluation through peer-to-peer work	44	70	28	6	1	1
There are good arrangements in place in Kent to support collaboration between schools	23	53	54	13	4	1

Base: 152

Table 12: Has your school submitted an application for the Promising Projects strand of the EEFfective Kent project?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	40	26%
No	81	53%
Don't know	31	20%
Total	152	100%

Table 13: Why did you apply for a Promising Project as part of the EEFfective Kent Project?

	Frequency	Percent
The programmes that our school applied for are appropriate to my school's needs	38	95%
The programmes that our school applied for are supported by robust evidence	30	75%
The matched funding was a strong incentive	27	68%
The programmes that our school applied for are clearly described	24	60%
The application process was straightforward and simple	20	50%
The funding has allowed our school to implement programmes we were previously interested in	19	48%
Our school wasn't aware of the intervention(s) until we heard about it through the EEFective Kent programme	8	20%
Our school was already planning to implement a Promising Project this year, so it made sense to access this funding	6	15%
Other schools we work with share the same interest in the programmes that I applied for	3	8%
The contribution required was equal to or less than the budget our school usually spends on programmes	1	3%
Other (please specify)	0	0%

Base=38

Appendix A11: Participation in EKP strands

Table 14: Participation in EKP strands by IDACI decile – Strand 1

			Strand 1		Total
			No	Yes	
IDACIDecile_REC	1	Count	33	6	39
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	84.60%	15.40%	100.00%
		% within Strand 1	6.90%	6.60%	6.80%
	2	Count	39	9	48
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	81.30%	18.80%	100.00%
		% within Strand 1	8.10%	9.90%	8.40%
	3	Count	40	4	44
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	90.90%	9.10%	100.00%
		% within Strand 1	8.40%	4.40%	7.70%
	4	Count	50	11	61
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	82.00%	18.00%	100.00%
		% within Strand 1	10.40%	12.10%	10.70%
	5	Count	38	12	50
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	76.00%	24.00%	100.00%
		% within Strand 1	7.90%	13.20%	8.80%
	6	Count	66	8	74
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	89.20%	10.80%	100.00%
		% within Strand 1	13.80%	8.80%	13.00%
	7	Count	74	17	91
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	81.30%	18.70%	100.00%
		% within Strand 1	15.40%	18.70%	16.00%
	8	Count	49	9	58
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	84.50%	15.50%	100.00%
		% within Strand 1	10.20%	9.90%	10.20%
	9	Count	52	12	64
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	81.30%	18.80%	100.00%
		% within Strand 1	10.90%	13.20%	11.20%
	10	Count	38	3	41
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	92.70%	7.30%	100.00%
		% within Strand 1	7.90%	3.30%	7.20%
Total	Count	479	91	570	
	% within IDACIDecile_REC	84.00%	16.00%	100.00%	

Source: IES analysis of KCC Stakeholder data and IDACI 2019 data (matched on postcode)

Table 15: Participation in EKP strands by IDACI decile – Strand 2

			Strand 2		Total
			No	Yes	
IDACIDecile_REC	1	Count	29	10	39
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	74.40%	25.60%	100.00%
		% within Strand 2	6.50%	8.10%	6.80%
	2	Count	39	9	48
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	81.30%	18.80%	100.00%
		% within Strand 2	8.70%	7.30%	8.40%
	3	Count	39	5	44
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	88.60%	11.40%	100.00%
		% within Strand 2	8.70%	4.00%	7.70%
	4	Count	47	14	61
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	77.00%	23.00%	100.00%
		% within Strand 2	10.50%	11.30%	10.70%
	5	Count	38	12	50
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	76.00%	24.00%	100.00%
		% within Strand 2	8.50%	9.70%	8.80%
	6	Count	60	14	74
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	81.10%	18.90%	100.00%
		% within Strand 2	13.50%	11.30%	13.00%
	7	Count	69	22	91
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	75.80%	24.20%	100.00%
		% within Strand 2	15.50%	17.70%	16.00%
	8	Count	44	14	58
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	75.90%	24.10%	100.00%
		% within Strand 2	9.90%	11.30%	10.20%
	9	Count	49	15	64
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	76.60%	23.40%	100.00%
		% within Strand 2	11.00%	12.10%	11.20%
	10	Count	32	9	41
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	78.00%	22.00%	100.00%
		% within Strand 2	7.20%	7.30%	7.20%
Total	Count	446	124	570	
	% within IDACIDecile_REC	78.20%	21.80%	100.00%	
	% within Strand 2	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	

Source: IES analysis of KCC Stakeholder data and IDACI 2019 data (matched on postcode)

Table 16: Participation in EKP strands by IDACI decile – Strand 3

			Strand 3		Total
			No	Yes	
IDACIDecile_REC	1	Count	35	4	39
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	89.70%	10.30%	100.00%
		% within Strand 3	6.70%	8.70%	6.80%
	2	Count	41	7	48
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	85.40%	14.60%	100.00%
		% within Strand 3	7.80%	15.20%	8.40%
	3	Count	40	4	44
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	90.90%	9.10%	100.00%
		% within Strand 3	7.60%	8.70%	7.70%
	4	Count	54	7	61
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	88.50%	11.50%	100.00%
		% within Strand 3	10.30%	15.20%	10.70%
	5	Count	47	3	50
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	94.00%	6.00%	100.00%
		% within Strand 3	9.00%	6.50%	8.80%
	6	Count	69	5	74
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	93.20%	6.80%	100.00%
		% within Strand 3	13.20%	10.90%	13.00%
	7	Count	84	7	91
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	92.30%	7.70%	100.00%
		% within Strand 3	16.00%	15.20%	16.00%
	8	Count	55	3	58
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	94.80%	5.20%	100.00%
		% within Strand 3	10.50%	6.50%	10.20%
	9	Count	59	5	64
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	92.20%	7.80%	100.00%
		% within Strand 3	11.30%	10.90%	11.20%
	10	Count	40	1	41
		% within IDACIDecile_REC	97.60%	2.40%	100.00%
		% within Strand 3	7.60%	2.20%	7.20%
Total	Count	524	46	570	
	% within IDACIDecile_REC	91.90%	8.10%	100.00%	
	% within Strand 3	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	

Source: IES analysis of KCC Stakeholder data and IDACI 2019 data (matched on postcode)

Appendix A12: Reasons for applying for participating in EKP

Table 17: EBT Survey – reasons for participating in EKP

		Responses	
		N	Percent of cases
Q16Multiresponse ^a	The course was supported by robust evidence	34	54.8%
	The course was clearly described	28	45.2%
	The course that our school applied for was appropriate to my school's needs	47	75.8%
	The funding has allowed our school to tackle areas we were previously interested in	25	40.3%
	Our school was already planning to access CPD in this area, so it made sense to access this funding	20	32.3%
	The application process was straightforward and simple	19	30.6%
	The matched funding was a strong incentive	21	33.9%
	The contribution required was equal to or less than the budget our school usually spends on CPD	4	6.5%
	Other schools we work with share the same interest in the courses that I applied for	4	6.5%
	Other	2	3.2%
Total		204	100.0%

Table 18: Baseline survey – Reasons for applying for a Promising Project

	Responses	
	N	Percent
The programmes that our school applied for are appropriate to my school's needs	38	95%
The programmes that our school applied for are supported by robust evidence	30	75%
The matched funding was a strong incentive	27	68%
The programmes that our school applied for are clearly described	24	60%
The application process was straightforward and simple	20	50%
The funding has allowed our school to implement programmes we were previously interested in	19	48%
Our school wasn't aware of the intervention(s) until we heard about it through the EEFective Kent programme	8	20%
Our school was already planning to implement a Promising Project this year, so it made sense to access this funding	6	15%
Other schools we work with share the same interest in the programmes that I applied for	3	8%
The contribution required was equal to or less than the budget our school usually spends on programmes	1	3%

Appendix A13: Reasons for not applying to EKP

Table 19: Baseline survey – Why have you not applied to EKP

	Responses	
	N	Percent
Lack of time and capacity to apply	25	31%
The school's contribution was too high	23	28%
The funding was not sufficient	20	25%
Other	16	20%
We are unaware of the EEFective Kent Project / Promising Projects strand of EEFective Kent	14	17%
None of the programmes are appropriate to the school's needs	12	15%
The school does not have the capacity to deliver the programmes	9	11%
The application process was too complicated	4	5%
Our school had previously done all the Promising Project interventions that were appropriate to our needs	2	2%
Our school was unaware of the matched-funding opportunities	1	1%
Insufficient interest in the programmes offered among school leadership	1	1%

Appendix A14: How participants heard about the EKP

Table 20: EBT Survey analysis – How participants heard about the EKP

		Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
Q17multiresponse ^a	KELSI website	9	11.4%	16.1%
	KELSI newsletter	10	12.7%	17.9%
	Headteacher briefings	28	35.4%	50.0%
	Social Media - Facebook/Twitter/LinkedIn	1	1.3%	1.8%
	Kent Association of Headteachers	8	10.1%	14.3%
	Local Inclusion Forum Team (LIFT)	5	6.3%	8.9%
	Education Endowment Foundation website	6	7.6%	10.7%
	Other	12	15.2%	21.4%
Total		79		

Table 21: Baseline survey – How participants heard about the training offer

	Responses	Percent of Cases
Headteacher briefings	33	83%
Kent Association of Headteachers	20	50%
The Education People	15	38%
Promising Projects Roadshow (virtual or face-to-face)	14	35%
KELSI website	12	30%
KELSI newsletter	6	15%
Education Endowment Foundation website	4	10%
Local Inclusion Forum Team (LIFT)	3	8%
Social media (Facebook/Twitter/Linked in)	2	5%
ResearchEd event	1	3%
Governors	0	0%
Other (please specify)	0	0%

Appendix A15: ELE support take-up information from KCC

Table 22: School take-up of ELE support by project

Evidence-based Training Course	No. of Schools receiving ELE Support	No. of schools not receiving ELE Support
Characteristics of Deprivation	16	1
Delivery of Remote Learning	11	14
Effective Learning Behaviours	3	9
Designing Effective Professional Development	6	8
Evidence-informed Curriculum Development	0	12
From Mitigation to Success	12	0
Improving Memory & Metacognition	5	9
SEND and Learning Behaviours	43	39
Tackling Educational Disadvantage	9	6
Training and Retaining Great Teachers	5	1
Total	110	99

Table 23: Average hours spent per project

Evidence-based Training Course	Total ELE Support Hours	Average ELE Support Hours per School
Characteristics of Deprivation	67.75	4.23
Delivery of Remote Learning	42	3.82
Effective Learning Behaviours	9	3
Designing Effective Professional Development	19	3.17
Evidence-informed Curriculum Development	0	0
From Mitigation to Success	6	0.5
Improving Memory & Metacognition	6	1.2
SEND and Learning Behaviours	187	4.35
Tackling Educational Disadvantage	43.5	4.83
Training and Retaining Great Teachers	24	4.8
Total	404.25	3.66

Appendix A16: Website Traffic data

Appendix Figure 1: Website traffic data

Country	City	Acquisition			Behaviour			Conversions Goal 2: Download ▾		
		Users ↓	New Users	Sessions	Bounce Rate	Pages/Session	Avg. Session Duration	Download (Goal 2 Conversion Rate)	Download (Goal 2 Completions)	Download (Goal 2 Value)
		173.44% ↑ <small>80,640 vs 65,491</small>	157.32% ↑ <small>71,900 vs 27,342</small>	226.00% ↑ <small>157,976 vs 48,459</small>	42.24% ↑ <small>45.38% vs 31.91%</small>	46.44% ↓ <small>2.24 vs 4.19</small>	4.27% ↓ <small>00:02:51 vs 00:02:59</small>	300.60% ↑ <small>24.16% vs 6.03%</small>	1,206.33% ↑ <small>38,171 vs 2,922</small>	1,206.00% ↑ <small>£1,908.58 vs £146.14</small>
1. United Kingdom	Maidstone									
	1 Jan 2019 - 20 Oct 2023	17,478 <small>(20.49%)</small>	15,403 <small>(21.42%)</small>	33,144 <small>(20.98%)</small>	45.59%	2.40	00:03:12	23.11%	7,658 <small>(20.06%)</small>	£382.88 <small>(20.06%)</small>
	14 Mar 2014 - 31 Dec 2018	6,313 <small>(20.22%)</small>	5,729 <small>(20.50%)</small>	9,294 <small>(19.18%)</small>	35.54%	4.59	00:02:50	5.97%	555 <small>(18.99%)</small>	£27.77 <small>(19.00%)</small>
	% Change	176.86%	168.86%	256.62%	28.29%	-47.80%	12.70%	286.92%	1,279.82%	1,278.95%
2. United Kingdom	Dartford									
	1 Jan 2019 - 20 Oct 2023	10,113 <small>(11.85%)</small>	8,476 <small>(11.79%)</small>	18,706 <small>(11.84%)</small>	46.09%	2.29	00:02:51	24.53%	4,589 <small>(12.02%)</small>	£229.44 <small>(12.02%)</small>
	14 Mar 2014 - 31 Dec 2018	1,754 <small>(5.62%)</small>	1,637 <small>(5.86%)</small>	2,338 <small>(4.82%)</small>	32.51%	2.76	00:01:45	1.24%	29 <small>(0.99%)</small>	£1.46 <small>(1.00%)</small>
	% Change	476.57%	417.78%	700.09%	41.79%	-17.03%	63.11%	1,877.81%	15,724.14%	15,600.00%
3. United Kingdom	Ashford									
	1 Jan 2019 - 20 Oct 2023	9,704 <small>(11.37%)</small>	8,651 <small>(12.03%)</small>	16,046 <small>(10.16%)</small>	40.98%	2.48	00:02:48	24.59%	3,946 <small>(10.34%)</small>	£197.29 <small>(10.34%)</small>
	14 Mar 2014 - 31 Dec 2018	1,754 <small>(5.62%)</small>	1,491 <small>(5.34%)</small>	2,747 <small>(5.67%)</small>	25.52%	5.10	00:03:24	5.31%	146 <small>(5.00%)</small>	£7.31 <small>(5.00%)</small>
	% Change	453.25%	480.21%	484.13%	60.60%	-51.39%	-17.53%	362.70%	2,602.74%	2,600.00%
4. United Kingdom	Canterbury									
	1 Jan 2019 - 20 Oct 2023	8,242 <small>(9.68%)</small>	6,752 <small>(9.29%)</small>	14,935 <small>(9.45%)</small>	49.71%	2.10	00:02:04	22.50%	3,361 <small>(8.81%)</small>	£168.06 <small>(8.81%)</small>
	14 Mar 2014 - 31 Dec 2018	5,846 <small>(18.73%)</small>	5,495 <small>(19.67%)</small>	8,944 <small>(18.46%)</small>	32.02%	4.36	00:03:39	4.25%	380 <small>(13.00%)</small>	£19.00 <small>(13.00%)</small>
	% Change	40.99%	22.88%	66.98%	55.24%	-51.91%	-43.38%	429.68%	784.47%	784.62%
5. United Kingdom	Gravesend									
	1 Jan 2019 - 20 Oct 2023	6,956 <small>(8.15%)</small>	6,196 <small>(8.62%)</small>	15,140 <small>(9.58%)</small>	43.24%	2.25	00:02:58	23.94%	3,624 <small>(9.49%)</small>	£181.21 <small>(9.49%)</small>
	14 Mar 2014 - 31 Dec 2018	2,660 <small>(8.52%)</small>	2,251 <small>(8.06%)</small>	3,975 <small>(8.20%)</small>	30.89%	3.96	00:02:54	2.94%	117 <small>(4.00%)</small>	£5.85 <small>(4.00%)</small>
	% Change	161.50%	175.26%	280.88%	39.98%	-43.20%	2.37%	713.23%	2,997.44%	3,000.00%
6. United Kingdom	Farnborough									
	1 Jan 2019 - 20 Oct 2023	5,904 <small>(6.92%)</small>	5,027 <small>(6.99%)</small>	11,750 <small>(7.44%)</small>	42.04%	2.33	00:03:05	28.60%	3,361 <small>(8.81%)</small>	£168.06 <small>(8.81%)</small>
	14 Mar 2014 - 31 Dec 2018	2,251 <small>(7.21%)</small>	2,104 <small>(7.53%)</small>	3,800 <small>(7.84%)</small>	37.68%	3.43	00:02:31	7.68%	292 <small>(9.99%)</small>	£14.61 <small>(10.00%)</small>
	% Change	162.28%	138.93%	209.21%	11.57%	-31.98%	22.97%	272.25%	1,051.03%	1,050.00%

Appendix A17: EBT survey analysis

Table 24: 'The Evidence-Based Training has improved my skills in exploring problems in school'

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	36	56.3
	Agree	26	40.6
	Neither agree nor disagree	2	3.1
	Total	64	100.0
Missing		5	
Total		69	

Table 25: 'The Evidence-Based Training has improved my ability to tightly define areas for improvement in my school'

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	38	59.4
	Agree	23	35.9
	Neither agree nor disagree	3	4.7
	Total	64	100.0
Missing		5	
Total		69	

Table 26: 'The Evidence-Based Training has improved my skills in developing an evidence informed implementation plan for change'

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	34	53.1
	Agree	28	43.8
	Neither agree nor disagree	2	3.1
	Total	64	100.0
Missing		5	
Total		69	

Table 27: 'The Evidence-Based Training has improved my knowledge about how to practically prepare for introducing change'

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	32	50.0
	Agree	29	45.3
	Neither agree nor disagree	2	3.1
	Disagree	1	1.6
	Total	64	100.0
Missing		5	
Total		69	

Table 28: 'The Evidence-Based Training has improved my understanding of how to implement and manage changes in my school'

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	32	50.0
	Agree	30	46.9
	Neither agree nor disagree	1	1.6
	Disagree	1	1.6
	Total	64	100.0
Missing		5	
Total		69	

Table 29: 'The Evidence-Based Training has improved my confidence in being able to create a leadership environment that is conducive to implementing evidence-based practice'

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	32	50.0
	Agree	29	45.3
	Neither agree nor disagree	2	3.1
	Disagree	1	1.6
	Total	64	100.0
Missing		5	
Total		69	

Table 30: 'The Evidence-Based Training has improved my skills in evaluating the impact of changes that have or will be introduced'

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	30	46.9
	Agree	32	50.0

	Neither agree nor disagree	2	3.1
	Total	64	100.0
Missing		5	
Total		69	

Table 31: 'The Evidence-Based Training has improved my understanding of how to sustain and scale up innovations that have proved successful'

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	30	46.9
	Agree	31	48.4
	Neither agree nor disagree	2	3.1
	Disagree	1	1.6
	Total	64	100.0
Missing		5	
Total		69	

Table 32: 'I have introduced evidence-based changes in my schools'

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	26	41.3
	Agree	24	38.1
	Neither agree nor disagree	11	17.5
	Disagree	2	3.2
	Total	63	100.0
Missing		6	
Total		69	

Table 33: 'I have improved my professional networks since participating in the training'

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	18	28.6
	Agree	30	47.6
	Disagree	1	1.6
	Neither agree nor disagree	14	22.2
	Total	63	100.0
Missing		6	
Total		69	

Table 34: 'I intend to implement new evidence-based practices in my school'

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	45	71.4
	Agree	16	25.4
	Neither agree nor disagree	2	3.2
	Total	63	100.0
Missing		6	
Total		69	

Table 35: 'I intend to devise an evidence-informed strategy for an aspect of school improvement'

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	44	69.8
	Agree	14	22.2
	Neither agree nor disagree	4	6.3
	Disagree	1	1.6
	Total	63	100.0
Missing		6	
Total		69	

You may re-use this document/publication (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0.

To view this licence, visit <https://nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3> or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

Where we have identified any third-party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned. The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education.

This document is available for download at <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk>



The Education Endowment Foundation
5th Floor, Millbank Tower
21–24 Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

<https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk>

 @EducEndowFoundn

 [Facebook.com/EducEndowFoundn](https://www.facebook.com/EducEndowFoundn)