



**External Evaluation of *Peer-to-Peer*:
a programme funded by the
London Schools Excellence Fund**

**Executive Summary
September 2015**

Dr Alison Daubney and Duncan Mackrill



Department
for Education

SUPPORTED BY

MAYOR OF LONDON



Executive Summary

'Peer-to-Peer'¹ is a professional development programme for Key Stage 3 Music teachers across London. This report is an external evaluation undertaken between April 2014 and September 2015 by the University of Sussex. This evaluation was commissioned by Music Mark, as part of the award of £255,500 from a competitive tender awarded by the London Schools Excellence Fund (LSEF). *Peer-to-Peer* is one of two music professional development programmes simultaneously funded through LSEF; the other, *Teach Through Music*, is delivered by Trinity Laban Conservatoire of Music and Dance in partnership with Sound Connections, Trinity College London, Barbican, Guildhall School of Music and Drama and the University of Greenwich. The programmes are collectively described as '*Music Excellence London*'. Coupled with the investment of £364,626 awarded *Teach Through Music*², the total investment in Key Stage 3 Music education through LSEF funding for '*Music Excellence London*' is £620,126.

Specifically, the *Peer-to-Peer* programme sought the following outcomes

Outcomes for teachers:

- Improved understanding of the characteristics of improved teaching and learning in Key Stage 3 Music
- Teach more musically
- Teachers have more understanding and make increased use of meaningful musical assessment
- Teachers develop their practice to plan appropriately for a wide range of pupils
- Improved teacher confidence

Outcomes for pupils:

- Increase in numbers of pupils engaging in music beyond the classroom
- Improved rate of continued engagement in music after the end of Key Stage 3
- Raise pupils' own aspirations in music

Outcomes for the 'system':

- Increase in Peer-to-Peer learning for teachers within departments / wider networks
- Developed understanding from senior leadership as to how to effectively support higher quality music teaching and learning
- Using music in the curriculum as a starting point, music contributes positively to whole school development

As the name *Peer-to-Peer* suggests, the programme intended to engage 160 Key Stage 3 Music teachers (the figure agreed with LSEF) in a year-long sustained peer mentoring programme across schools, following a series of CPD half-day courses and supported through an online

¹ More information on the Peer-to-Peer programme can be found at <http://www.musicmark.org.uk/training-events/peer-to-peer-programme-2014-2015>

² Further information on the Teach Through Music programme can be found at <http://www.sound-connections.org.uk/teach-through-music>

environment. The courses were planned and delivered by an Expert Panel consisting of seven 'expert practitioners' from state and independent schools within and beyond London, and from one music service.

Three cohorts of teachers were recruited from 47 secondary schools, one special school and two music services. Cohorts 1 and 2 were all classroom music practitioners with varying levels of experience. Cohort 3 included mostly instrumental teachers from two music services.

In total, 71 teachers and 11 mentors attended at least one half-day CPD course. 18 of these 71 teachers initially attended an initial mentor meeting with 7 mentors; 12 teachers continued to develop their work beyond this to varying degrees.

Context of this evaluation

The evaluation uses multiple data collection methods and is based on data collected from a wide variety of stakeholders representing all cohorts, Expert Panel members and the Music Mark steering group. The data collected across all elements of the evaluation represents the views of 10 mentors, 43 teachers who attended at least one half-day CPD course and 6 Music Mark steering group and Expert Panel members. The views of 8 of the 44 teachers who showed an initial interest but did not register are also included. The remainder of the 160 teachers were not included in this external evaluation as they attended a 'pilot' half-day course (Going for Gold) in summer 2013 but had no formal engagement with *Peer-to-Peer* and no details about these teachers were passed on to the evaluation team.

Music Mark have internally evaluated the programme in line with Project Oracle Level 2 requirements and the external evaluation has, where appropriate, supported this reporting. The data required by LSEF for this purpose is numerical (for example, the number of pupils engaging in further study of Music at Key Stage 4). However, it should be pointed out that such measures alone are neither meaningful nor appropriate as they do not provide sufficient depth of understanding upon which important judgments of 'success' are made. Additionally, these figures ignore the context in which this programme of work took place.

The expectations from LSEF relating to performance measures across *Peer-to-Peer* unfortunately show a narrow and inappropriate view of how to gauge the success across a professional learning programme for music educators in schools. They also show limited understanding about why the measures and methods designed for 'core' subjects are unsuitable for other subject, including Music.

Therefore, this external evaluation set out with the intention of providing a broader range of evaluation evidence which can more meaningfully demonstrate professional changes that cannot be adequately shown or interpreted by just numbers and spreadsheets and therefore offers a range of narrative perspectives of reality. Regardless of the ways in which evaluation is embedded, across programmes of such a short length of time there is likely to be little instant change, and current educational policy is, at times, working against the likelihood of such outcomes being useful or realistic.

This executive summary is based upon key points from the full evaluation report, produced alongside this summary and builds upon the interim report presented in September 2014.

Summary of Main Findings

1 Engagement

- 1.1 Engagement with *Peer-to-Peer* has been significantly impactful for a small number of teachers and mentors who fully engaged with the CPD and persevered with the peer-mentoring programme.
- 1.2 Sustaining engagement in the *Peer-to-Peer* programme has been challenging. There has been a considerable drop-out rate in all cohorts. 71 teachers and 11 mentors attended at least one half day CPD course. There was a high drop out rate after course 1 and before course 2 in cohort 2, and to a lesser extent in cohort 1. Most teachers who attended at least one half day CPD course did not engage with the mentoring aspect of the programme. Reasons given related mostly to a lack of interest and/or relevance following session one of the CPD courses. Lack of time or cover for lessons was also occasionally mentioned.
- 1.3 44 teachers who showed initial interest did not follow-up by attending any courses. Of these, only 5 teachers completed a registration form; the rest offered no firm commitment to come. Most classroom teachers who attended at least one course completed an application form. Therefore the completion of a registration form appears to signal intention to engage at least initially.
- 1.4 The balance of the 160 teachers (this is the number of teachers agreed in the revised LSEF funding bid) attended a pilot course as part of the 'South West London Music Education Partnership' Summer 2013 CPD afternoon but had no further engagement with *Peer-to-Peer*.
- 1.5 Senior leadership in some schools did not prioritise the subject-specific CPD during school time and getting cover for the final lessons of the day to enable attendance was occasionally not possible.
- 1.6 Engaging instrumental teachers and classroom teachers in the same CPD sessions needed more planning in order for all teachers to feel that the sessions were worthwhile and relevant.
- 1.7 Lack of choice about whether or not to engage with the *Peer-to-Peer* programme negatively affected participant motivation and teachers' likelihood of engaging beyond one initial session.
- 1.8 Across all three cohorts, 18 teachers attended an initial mentor meeting with 7 mentors. 12 of these teachers stayed in touch with mentors to some extent, with some of these 12 co-developing an area of interest within their work.
- 1.9 The *Peer-to-Peer* programme was not clear about the minimum expectations and commitment, benefits and outcomes. Some of the materials gave conflicting information which was not a wholly accurate representation of the offer or philosophy.
- 1.10 The small numbers of participants engaging in the peer mentoring programme affected the morale of mentors and teachers, further impeding development and engagement.

- 1.11 Some teachers turned down the opportunity to be mentored either because they felt that it was not what they needed at this stage in their career or because they felt that the mentor allocated did not have sufficient breadth of experience in their own context.
- 1.12 The lack of regular activity and rhythm within the programme (particularly the very long break between the end of the CPD courses and the matching up of mentors and mentees) meant that, in some cases, momentum and interest were lost.
- 1.13 The geographical locality of mentors' and teachers' schools and homes needs to be taken into account when matching people up for out-of-hours work. Teachers' interests, strengths and context also need to be taken into account. This was a significant issue in the *Peer-to-Peer* programme.
- 1.14 Early career teachers generally liked the idea of being matched up with a mentor. Those who engaged with the programme throughout were keen to develop aspects of their work despite pointing out significant logistical challenges.

2 Programme Design

- 2.1 The *Peer-to-Peer* programme was apparently modelled upon a pilot course which used a different mode of delivery, had different aims and aspirations and was a one-off opportunity. Thus the pilot did not adequately reflect or inform the plans for the *Peer-to-Peer* programme.
- 2.2 The programme bid and design did not initially consider what 'success' looks like and the outcomes were only finally decided after the structure of the programme had been designed. This created dissonance between the two and meant that the programme design was not specifically geared towards meeting the outcomes from the outset.
- 2.3 It is clear that a one-size-fits-all CPD programme, with no choice about the sessions attended and delivered by 'expert teachers', is not a suitable model for all teachers and does not universally benefit professional learning and engagement. Early career teachers liked the opportunities to hear from 'expert teachers' but some teachers with more experience found the mode of delivery and content unsuitable and unchallenging. Across this programme, the CPD sessions did not provide sufficient challenge for *all* teachers attending each course, who came with a wide range of experiences and from differing contexts.
- 2.4 Bringing people together to network face-to-face has consistently been identified as the most appreciated aspect of the *Peer-to-Peer* programme, whether in the CPD sessions or the Expert Panel meetings.
- 2.5 Mentoring implies a hierarchical relationship in which someone is supported and coached by a more experienced colleague or professional. The terms 'peer-to-peer' and 'mentoring' are not interchangeable and Music Mark should decide whether any future work is based upon a coaching/mentoring model or seeks genuine peer collaboration.

- 2.6 Whilst there is little evidence of change or impact for most teachers, the Expert Panel and some mentors were very positive about their experiences and how this had translated into developments in their teaching and thinking. Those engaged with the Expert Panel meetings stated that they benefitted professionally from engaging in challenging professional face-to-face conversations on a regular basis.
- 2.7 Not all of the mentors felt the CPD programme was professionally beneficial to them and some did not have any success in engaging teachers with the mentoring programme, despite their best efforts to do so.
- 2.8 Practitioner mobilisation (i.e. encouraging practitioners to reflect upon and develop their own practice by observing and working alongside colleagues in the classroom) was the most valued aspect of *Peer-to-Peer* for two mentors. These mentors had an opportunity to be observed by another experienced teacher (who was collecting evidence for a case study about the impact of *Peer-to-Peer*) and discuss the lesson afterwards, encouraging development of self-reflection on curriculum, pedagogy and assessment. They found this self-reflection very useful to consider and further develop their own practice. Whilst this is effectively outside of the *Peer-to-Peer* programme structure, this model of professional development is worth further developing in the future as it is rooted in inquiry-based applied practice and offers a framework for reflection and discussion.
- 2.9 Some teachers did not engage with the mentoring programme because they felt that what they needed from a CPD programme was not met through *Peer-to-Peer* and that the mentors and expert teachers appointed did not have sufficient experience of a wider range of contexts, particularly for those in challenging schools.
- 2.10 Teachers and mentors expressed a preference for 'active' engagement in sessions. This mode of learning was embedded in the professional practice day attended by 6 registered teachers and 7 mentors, whereas sessions at the half-day CPD courses were viewed as mostly 'passive'.
- 2.11 The term 'Expert Panel' (which is not the term these very experienced teachers used to describe themselves) implies that these teachers are more 'expert' than others who signed up for the programme. This perceived hierarchy meant that some teachers attending CPD sessions felt that their own experience and expertise was ignored or under-valued.

3 Outcomes for Teachers

- 3.1. Self-identified attributes of excellent teachers were mostly 'procedural', which is perhaps unsurprising given the generic rather than subject-specific ways in which teacher competence is currently 'judged' in schools.
- 3.2 Self-defined personal construct responses demonstrated that teachers in the courses had a wide range of ideas about traits of 'excellent teaching' and how they rated themselves in relation to these, confirming the need for their own starting points, context, motivations and interests to be taken into account in the design of any future programme.

- 3.3 22 teachers and 8 mentors stated that they were aware of the key factors needed to promote excellent teaching and learning in music; 18 teachers and 7 mentors stated that they have developed in relation to these as a result of their engagement with the programme.
- 3.4 18 teachers and 7 mentors stated that the music curriculum in their school developed as a result of their engagement with the *Peer-to-Peer* programme. The positive responses came from those teachers and mentors who had engaged most with the programme and attended at least 2 half-day CPD courses.
- 3.5 17 teachers and 7 mentors stated that assessment in their school had developed, mostly around feedback and formative assessment.
- 3.6 17 teachers and 6 mentors stated that the range of pedagogies they used had developed as a result of their engagement with the *Peer-to-Peer* programme. Modelling different pedagogies at the professional practice day was deemed useful, as it allowed them to see ideas in action.
- 3.7 17 teachers and 6 mentors stated that their engagement with the *Peer-to-Peer* programme had impacted upon their planning. There were a few examples of significant changes in planning. There was very little awareness of the London Curriculum and where teachers had come across this, none were using it.
- 3.8 12 teachers and 5 mentors stated that their use of differentiation had developed as a result of their engagement with the *Peer-to-Peer* programme.
- 3.9 15 teachers and 5 mentors stated that they were more confident in their role as a result of their engagement in the programme.
- 3.10 In total, 21 teachers and 7 mentors stated that there had been 'some' or 'significant' impact upon their own work as a result of their engagement with the *Peer-to-Peer* programme.

4 Outcomes Relating to Senior Leadership

- 4.1 5 teachers and 4 mentors thought that their senior leadership had a greater understanding of excellent teaching and learning in music as a result of their participation in the programme. One headteacher, from a school involved in the Music in Secondary Schools Trust, has joined the London Music Champions Scheme.
- 4.2 2 teachers and 2 mentors stated that music now had a greater role in whole school development as a result of their engagement with the *Peer-to-Peer* programme.

5 Engaging with Other Professionals

- 5.1 9 teachers and 6 mentors stated that peer-to-peer learning within their department had increased as a result of their engagement with the programme. Of these, 4 teachers stated that peer-to-peer learning between departments had also increased.

- 5.2 9 teachers and 5 mentors stated that peer-to-peer learning across wider networks had increased as a result of their engagement with the programme.

6 Outcomes for Pupils

- 6.1 The exclusion of Arts subjects in the English Baccalaureate (EBacc) performance measure, recently made compulsory by the Government, is having a detrimental impact upon uptake of Music at Key Stage 4. Examples of schools dropping Music as an option at Key Stage 4 in order to make children study for subjects within the English Baccalaureate or to have more time on 'core' subjects were shared with the evaluation team.
- 6.2 17 teachers and 6 mentors stated that more Key Stage 3 pupils are taking part in music beyond the classroom.
- 6.3 18 teachers and 6 mentors stated that, as a result of their engagement with the *Peer-to-Peer* programme, pupils had higher aspirations in music.
- 6.4 Based upon baseline and final figures provided by Music Mark, in total, 5 teachers and mentors stated that more pupils would be studying music at Key Stage 4 in this academic year. In total, 7 teachers and mentors stated that more pupils were staying musically active in Key Stage 4. These figures are also supported by the external evaluation data.

7 Peer-To-Peer Online Network

- 7.1 Most of the teachers and mentors who attended at least one *Peer-to-Peer* CPD session have registered for the online network. Of these, around half logged into the network at least once.
- 7.2 There is an almost even split in terms of teachers who consider an online network to be useful in engaging with the music education community and those who do not. In addition, some teachers expressed that they did not want to share their materials or ideas in an online environment.
- 7.3 Logging in (rather than having open access or via an app) is considered by some respondents as an inconvenience that puts people off.
- 7.4 The functionality of private meeting space for the mentor groups on the online network has not been well supported. Participants expressed a strong preference for face-to-face CPD, networking and mentoring.

8 Sustainability and Legacy

- 8.1 Two external consultants were employed to help to model the mentoring process and to regularly engage with mentors and teachers to facilitate working together. Without this sustained significant investment of time and finance, it is difficult to envisage how *Peer-to-Peer* can sustain adequate support of mentors in order to keep the momentum of a programme such as this moving forwards.
- 8.2 Participants expressed a desire for future CPD which brings teachers together to network and tackle some of the 'bigger issues' in music education in ways which acknowledge and build upon their wide ranging levels of experience and contexts.
- 8.3 Teachers should have some choice about areas of their practice which they wish to develop, and be supported to do this. There should be an expectation that professional development impacts upon pupils.
- 8.4 Teachers and mentors need to develop and cement professional relationships face-to-face in the first instance. With limited or in some cases, no opportunity for meeting face-to-face, the online network was not popular for developing professional relationships and only a very small number of mentors and teachers used the secure space on the network for this purpose.
- 8.5 A working definition of 'excellent teaching', a key outcome sought from the *Peer-to-Peer* programme, has not yet been circulated.
- 8.6 The timetabling of sessions is critical with weekends not being welcomed by some teachers. At the point in the academic year when Key Stage 4 coursework was due, the mentoring was finally organised and some teachers were then too busy to commit.
- 8.7 Not all dates were given to teachers with what some felt was realistic notice. Some teachers found this challenging and were frustrated by the short notice at which some sessions, including the professional development day, were organised. This was exacerbated by late notice from LSEF about the bid being successful, coupled with LSEF's expectations that the timeframe of the programme could be condensed and that the programme started immediately.
- 8.8 Bringing people together to network face-to-face has consistently been identified as the most appreciated and useful aspect of the *Peer-to-Peer* programme.
- 8.9 Most teachers identified at least one positive suggestion about potential ways in which they could use the learning from *Peer-to-Peer* during the next academic year.

Key recommendations for Music Mark

1. In order to maximise participation, engagement and retention Music Mark should reflect upon levels of engagement in the *Peer-to-Peer* programme and ensure the key reasons for low participation and high drop-out identified in this report are effectively addressed.
2. Music Mark need to think carefully about the values and philosophy underpinning their organisation and any future programmes, and make sure that these are commonly agreed and clearly communicated. They should be clear about what they are doing and why they are doing it.
3. Future programmes should be designed and led with significant input from teachers and other professionals with high levels of experience of leading high quality CPD for specific communities in order that they are worthwhile, authentic and genuine.
4. Ensure the consistent high quality of CPD offers and other professional learning is built upon the ownership, needs and strengths of all involved in the learning community, recognising their different roles and experience. Any future programme needs to be suitably differentiated for the needs of these distinct different groups rather than adopting a one-size-fits-all approach that fails to meet many participants' needs.
5. Future programmes need to be more carefully and realistically planned with outcomes defined from the outset, from which activities and opportunities will be designed, rather than designing a programme of activities without specific outcomes in mind.
6. There should be adequate lead-in time before the programme begins to avoid the rhythm of the programme being interrupted whilst organisers consider the next steps. Participants should be kept informed at all times.
7. Professional development should offer a range of appropriate choices and challenges and not be predominantly modelled on a 'deficit model'³. It should allow for personal choice, joint practice development and sufficiently challenging practice development/professional learning underpinned by teacher inquiry.
8. Future programmes need to consider whether they would be more effective if organised in smaller geographical areas, in order to establish and develop communities with more of a focus on quality rather than being detracted by the aim of demonstrating a wide geographical spread.
9. Music Mark should be very clear about the aims, outcomes and expected levels of commitment for different groups across the programme so participants understand the commitment, expectations and outcomes sought.
10. Music Mark should consider whether a more practical, hands-on, high quality musical approach to modelling, sharing and developing practice would be advantageous in drawing teachers in and meeting their expectations more effectively.

³*Deficit model' - this is one of the nine models proposed by Kennedy (2005). In this model, individual teachers have perceived 'deficits' or 'weakness' which needs to be rectified. This model tends to be demotivating.*

11. Realistic, clear expectations and the kinds of impact being sought for all participants and organisations as a result of the programme, would help to mitigate against unrealistic expectations.
12. Programme leaders should ensure they have a common, shared understanding of a wide range of tools used and their implementation in order to effectively gauge impact.
13. The design of the programme should avoid an overreliance on top down delivery and include more participant engagement drawing upon expertise and good practice across a range of contexts.
14. Music Mark should recognise the limited impact of an over-reliance on one-off sessions and seek to avoid these in the future, instead offering high quality longer-term learning frameworks in which there is periodical, incremental CPD and an expectation of deliberate and thoughtful on-going applied professional development of practice in the interim.
15. The relationship between peer collaboration and mentoring needs to be fully considered to ensure that any future programme recognises the differences between the two and is clear about what it seeks to do.
16. If a mentoring programme is established it needs to be developed in much more bespoke ways to acknowledge and work with teachers with a range of different experiences and from different contexts, to acknowledge more carefully where they are now, where they have come from and their aspirations for the future.
17. If a mentor programme is established, more careful matching of teacher 'mentors' with the appropriate and relevant expertise and school context with 'mentees' would be beneficial. These groups and pairings would benefit from being organised more locally wherever possible particularly where twilight meetings are an important element of the programme, although clearly this is conditional upon attracting a larger number of mentors with which to work.
18. Appointed mentors should be given adequate time, coupled with high quality training and on-going support to enable them to undertake their role effectively and with due status.
19. Music Mark should identify why the mode of working of the Expert Panel was successful and why these very experienced teachers continued to learn from each other, noting in particular that these regular face-to-face meetings took place during school time.
20. In developing the online environment, the purpose, value and accessibility should be carefully considered, as well as how this network sits alongside or complements other online forums.
21. Multiple opportunities for face-to-face meeting to firmly establishing good working relationships should be introduced before implementing the online environment, wherever possible. In addition, greater clarity is required about the purpose of the online space for mentor groups and if and how the role of this environment supports the mentoring role.

22. Collaborative working which encourages 'Practitioner mobilisation' – where they are encouraged to meet face to face to reflect upon and develop their own practice by observing and working alongside colleagues in other settings – should be considered as a more effective approach to emphasise partnership and the co-learning opportunities arising from this model. This would also reduce the perception around the hierarchy of mentor and mentee and the resulting power relations, to scaffold, support and develop the practice of all the teachers involved.
23. Music Mark should realistically consider whether such a programme is possible or desirable in the future without the significant time and financial investment needed to scaffold and support groups of teachers working together.
24. Terminology is important and value bound, particularly around peer collaboration, mentoring and coaching. Future programmes should be clear about their underlying philosophy.
25. If a programme is based upon a pilot phase, then the pilot programme should be a realistic representation on which the full programme is based in order to properly test the model.

Other recommendations

26. When participants are asked to complete evaluation exercises, these should be constructed so that they are able to effectively gauge learning and perspectives against specific learning objectives and outcomes sought.
27. *Peer-to-Peer* should provide evidence of impact – for example, through the development of a small number of high quality, realistic Case Studies, and sharing of evidence-based reports. This will assist school leadership teams and funders to make an informed decision about the quality of the offering and understand the potential importance of music-specific professional learning opportunities. This is also more likely to address some of the issues around releasing teachers from school.
28. Programme leaders should ensure they have a common, shared understanding of any evaluation tools used and their implementation in order to effectively evaluate learning. Where designing their own tools, these should be fit for purpose.
29. Going forward, Music Mark need to consider the 'quality' of shared resources etc. and make a decision on whether everything is suitable for their online environment in order that this is valued by the different participant groups. Additionally, they need to consider how to help teachers to develop the skills to critique resources, teaching strategies rather than accepting their usefulness in any context
30. Music Mark might consider the feasibility and demand for developing an App for mobile devices to enable teachers to engage with their online environment without the need to manually go to the website and remember their login in order to check for new material/forum discussions.
31. Music Mark should consider the benefits of providing a regular Newsletter with links to new material and discussions on their online environment.

32. The timing of professional or networking meetings should be carefully considered to facilitate maximum attendance and avoid interrupting family time. In addition, weekend or evening events running at the same time as contracted work undertaken by instrumental teachers should be avoided.
33. Like any organisation, Music Mark should be realistic about their strengths and priorities and also where they have less experience. They should think carefully about where they can provide high quality support in partnership with others and also be mindful about where other organisations may be better placed than them, to lead work with some sectors of the music education community.

Recommendations for wider music education sector

- WS1 Music organisations need to work together to make the case for music-specific, rather than generic, professional learning opportunities in order to more effectively convince teachers and senior leadership teams of its importance.
- WS2 Continuing professional development, resources and music educator support should be designed and resourced with significant input from teachers and suitably experienced professionals so that it is designed and presented in ways which are authentic and genuine and is more likely to be valued by all.
- WS3 More high quality music-specific professional learning needs to be developed and music educators should have regular access to this. In line with the recommendations of the Teacher Development Trust, schools, organisations and senior managers should hold CPD providers to account for the quality and usefulness of their programmes.
- WS4 Professional development for music educators should offer a range of appropriate choices and challenges. There should be bespoke options that are relevant to educators at all stages of their career and adaptable to differing contexts.
- WS5 Future professional development should be based around a range of different models, considering a wide range of models from within and beyond education. It should allow for personal choice, joint practice development and personal professional learning.
- WS6 Professional development for educators should be rooted in an applied inquiry-based philosophy and framework, relevant to a teacher's own work context and with an expectation that there is an adherence to classroom practice.
- WS7 Professional development for music educators working in a range of different educational settings should imply methods and approaches that are inherently both useful and musical, bringing together a wide range of knowledge sources into applied work.
- WS8 Professional development for teachers should be longitudinal, offering regular support, high quality input and follow-up and promote an environment where critical engagement with one's own practice is central.

- WS9 In order to develop professional learning in the future, organisations should first develop a good understanding of already existing networks (e.g. run by schools, chains and hubs across specific locations or school clusters) to work out how to support and enhance these, as well as identifying where there are areas in which formal and informal networks are less well developed.
- WS10 Future provision should plan to create and sustain pan-London online and physical networks which recognise and work with existing provision without significant duplication.
- WS11 There is a need for a much greater understanding from funders and CPD providers about the purpose, potential, design and impact of programmes and how they should be evaluated. Currently, there is frequently an unhealthy focus on generic (often metric-driven) measures and impacts that do not aid understanding and can skew interpretations. Additionally, there is often a lack of value placed upon, and the space to delineate, the *qualities* of experiences too (through, for example, attention to thoughts, feelings, opinions and narrative accounts). These need to be considered together in ways which consider the whole ecological system and help to unpick the perceptions of reality from reality itself.
- WS12 Funders should recognise that measuring the ‘impact’ of a programme at the end of the lifespan of the programme only gives a snapshot. Opportunities to properly assess the longer-term impact can only take place after extended time and therefore we recommend that evaluation of impact is studied over a much longer period of time.
- WS13 All future programmes, regardless of the duration, should be devised with outcomes defined from the outset. Activities and learning opportunities should be planned to meet this desired learning, rather than a programme of activities being designed before worthwhile and specific outcomes are clearly defined.
- WS14 The learning from *Peer-to-Peer* and *Teach Through Music* should be widely shared with hubs and other interested organisations in order to help the music education sector and funding bodies to understand what is possible, and also worthwhile in terms of future professional development for music educators. More work needs to be done to help organisations and funders to recognise and understand the barriers, challenges and logistics.
- WS15 There should be an expectation that teachers continue to engage in subject-specific professional learning throughout their career.
- WS16 Professional/lifelong learning should be an aspiration throughout a music educator’s career. Short-term CPD seen as an option can distract from the core business of raising standards, rather than contributing to it.
- WS17 Funders should be mindful that there is an inevitable duplication of resources if two programmes are simultaneously funded across the same geographical area. It also reduces the number of potential participants available for either community, and risks diminishing the impact or uptake of one or both programmes. It is our recommendation that if this situation arises in the future, projects should be joined up from the outset.