

## National Professional Qualifications Performance Review Report

### The Church of England Foundation for Educational Leadership

14 and 15 November 2019

#### 1 Provider information

Date of accreditation	31 July 2017
Region	Midlands, South East, South West, North East and North West
Name of lead contact	Emma Trenier
Lead contact telephone number	0207 898 1535
Lead contact email address	<a href="mailto:emma.trenier@churchofengland.org">emma.trenier@churchofengland.org</a>
NPQs being delivered	NPQH

#### 2 Review information

Name(s) of reviewer(s)	Peter Callow
Date(s) of visit(s)	14 and 15 November 2019
Provider's personnel interviewed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Andy Wolfe – Deputy Chief Education Officer (Leadership Development, Church of England Foundation for Educational Leadership (CEFEL))</li> <li>▪ Emma Trenier – Head of Programmes (CEFEL)</li> <li>▪ Rob Robson – Programme Lead for Church of England Professional Qualification for Headship (CofEPQH)</li> <li>▪ Sue Julyan – Headteacher of Torre Church of England Academy, lead contact and learning event host for the CofEPQH, South West region</li> <li>▪ Richard Tyson – Director of Teaching School and SCITT at Bennett Memorial Diocesan School, lead contact and learning event host for the CofEPQH, South East region</li> <li>▪ Kelly Lee – Headteacher of Sneiton St. Stephen's Church of England Primary School, lead contact and learning event host for the CofEPQH, Midlands region</li> <li>▪ Jenny Marshall – Headteacher of South Wilford Endowed Church of England Primary School, learning event host for the CofEPQH, Midlands region</li> <li>▪ Neville Norcross – Chair of CofEPQH Steering Group</li> <li>▪ Jemma Adams – Programmes and Projects Officer, CEFEL</li> <li>▪ Jo Palmer – Executive Assistant and Operations Support Officer, CEFEL</li> </ul>
Participants interviewed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 6</li> </ul>

Direct observations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ NPQH</li> </ul>
Documents reviewed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Team Roles and Responsibilities</li> <li>▪ Self-Assessment Report</li> <li>▪ 2019-2020 Handbook</li> <li>▪ 2020-2021 Handbook (Draft)</li> <li>▪ Evaluation and continuous learning plan (2019/20)</li> <li>▪ Applying for the CofEPQH</li> <li>▪ Managing Risks October 2019</li> <li>▪ Diversity and inclusion actions</li> <li>▪ Memorandum of Understanding with Dioceses and Partner Schools (Draft)</li> <li>▪ Resourcing Plan 2020-21</li> <li>▪ Moderated assignments – review of common issues (Year 1)</li> <li>▪ NPQH Assessment Overview</li> <li>▪ Academic misconduct policy</li> <li>▪ Terms and conditions</li> <li>▪ Agreement for data collection and analysis</li> <li>▪ Complaints policy</li> <li>▪ The National Church Institutions Grievance Procedure</li> <li>▪ The National Church Institutions Disciplinary Procedure</li> <li>▪ Year 2 LE 1 &amp; 2 Venue feedback</li> <li>▪ Year 1 Evaluation (2018/19)</li> <li>▪ 19-20 LE2 (North West) Evaluation feedback</li> <li>▪ 19-20 LE2 (North East) Evaluation feedback</li> <li>▪ Spencer, E. and Lucas, B (2019) Christian Leadership in Schools: An initial review of evidence and current practices: Church of England</li> </ul>
Metrics reviewed	1-7
Date of most recent self-assessment	June 2019
Other review activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Leadership and management discussions</li> <li>▪ Governance discussions</li> <li>▪ Participant discussions</li> <li>▪ Facilitator and Regional Host discussions</li> <li>▪ Review of the CEFEL website</li> </ul>

### 3 Participation information

National Professional Qualification	Year	Number of recruited participants	Target	Percentage Change (+/-)	Numbers from schools with >30% FSM	Numbers of participants from non-white British backgrounds
NPQH	1	89	80	+ 11%	Not required Y1	Target = 2% Actual = 4% (4)
	2	143	100	+ 43%	Target = 10 % Actual = 7% (10)	Target = 4% Actual = 5% (7)

#### 4 Detailed assessment of performance against the Quality Framework

<b>Provider's leadership and management</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>A General management</b>	<b>8</b>
<p>Evidence base/Evidence source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Self-Assessment Report</li> <li>▪ Leadership and management discussions</li> <li>▪ Governance discussions</li> <li>▪ Participant discussions</li> <li>▪ Facilitator and host discussions</li> <li>▪ Review of the website, policies and documentation</li> </ul> <p>Evaluation: General Management of the NPQH qualification meets expectations.</p> <p>Wise, compassionate and effective leadership at every level ensures the success of the NPQH programme which is offered as part of the Church of England Professional Qualification for Headship (CofEPQH). There is a commitment to the CofE Vision for Education that results in a unique experience for participants of the Christian faith, other faiths and none. Those interviewed during the review, without exception, commented on the benefits of the opportunity the programme provides. They talk, for example, about, 'being able to reflect on their personal mission and motivation' and about being 'empowered'.</p> <p>There is a very clear structure for governance with the Foundation's Deputy Chief Education Officer (Leadership Development), holding the Head of Programmes to account, and reporting to the Foundation's Trustees. A Steering Group is responsible for the governance of the CofEPQH and has broadened its representation as the programme has developed to include those from regions and partner schools, the dioceses and the central team. Changes in the representation have meant that the Steering Group has lost some of the effectiveness of its core strategic function, for example regarding the robust monitoring and evaluation of the quality of provision and outcomes and to risk management.</p> <p>Rigorous financial control and efficient administrative processes all contribute to the smooth running of the CofEPQH and the adherence to statutory requirements. A Personal Data Policy is set out in the 'Terms and Conditions' and in addition, there is a separate document entitled 'Agreement for data collection and analysis', which provides greater detail. For example, it sets out what personal data will be collected and how the DfE and its Quality Assurance Agent will use any personal data shared with them by the provider.</p>	
<b>B Engagement strategy</b>	<b>9</b>
<p>Evidence base/Evidence source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Self-Assessment Report</li> <li>▪ Leadership and management discussions</li> <li>▪ Participant discussions</li> <li>▪ Review of the website, policies and documentation</li> </ul> <p>Evaluation: The provider's engagement strategy exceeds expectations.</p> <p>The success of CEFEL's engagement strategy is evident in its continued growth, so that by 2020 it will become a national provider with eight nominated regions, each led by a partner school. This is a result of the sensitively managed work of the Foundation's Deputy Chief Education Officer (Leadership</p>	

Development) and the Head of Programmes in encouraging involvement from all the Church of England dioceses. This partnership is key to ensuring a distinctive and high-quality CofEPQH programme, the aims of which are clearly set out in the renewed 'Memorandum of Understanding with Dioceses and Partner Schools'. Of fundamental importance is the fact the partnership enables the programme to be hosted by the lead contacts from the partner schools who form personal and supportive relationships with participants. Several referred to this creating a 'safe place' in which they can confidently explore their values as leaders and learn how to create an ethos in the schools in which they work that is aligned to the Vision for Education.

The regional model combines the expertise of local leaders with that of the central team and lies at the heart of the predominately face-to-face delivery in residential that has existed and, in the pilot, mixed-mode delivery that is underway in the south-west region. This has a reduced number of face-to-face days but incorporates 10 hours of study in a virtual classroom and involvement in more guest webinars. The innovative mixed-mode delivery model has been designed to help overcome geographical and financial barriers and will be available as a choice of study in all regions from 2020.

<b>C</b>	<b>Resourcing and contingency planning</b>	<b>8</b>
----------	--	----------

- Evidence base/Evidence source:
- Self-Assessment Report
  - Leadership and management discussions
  - Participant discussions
  - Facilitator and host discussions
  - Review of the website, policies and documentation
  - Programme observation

Evaluation:  
Resourcing and contingency planning meets expectations.

A significant factor in delivering a high-quality CofEPQH programme consistently across the different regions has been the role of the Programme Lead. He has been the 'core' facilitator in nearly all the face-to-face learning events to date and participants are quick to acknowledge the experience and expertise that he brings. The provider recognises the importance of building capacity as the number of regions grows and in 2018 recruited a second Programme Facilitator who shadowed in one region. He is now leading the programme in a different region. The regional hosts from partner schools contribute to facilitation so that currently 80% of the face-to-face delivery team are serving school leaders. 100% of guest webinar delivery is by serving school leaders.

Two regional hosts have already been identified as having the potential to develop their role into lead facilitation, thus helping to build further capacity within the delivery team. Training for hosts and facilitators is ongoing so that they are up to date, for example with the use of video-conferencing technology as well as programme structure and content.

Currently, the provider does not have a formal arrangement for provision to be made for participants to move to alternative programmes to complete their study in the event of accreditation being removed.

<b>D</b>	<b>Recruitment and admission of participants (metrics 1, 2 and 3)</b>	<b>9</b>
----------	---	----------

- Evidence base/Evidence source:
- Self-Assessment Report
  - Leadership and management discussions
  - Review of the website, policies and documentation
  - Data for metrics 1, 2 and 3

Evaluation:  
Recruitment and admission of participants exceeds expectations.

The dioceses play a key role in signposting the CofEPQH programme through Diocesan Officers and the close contact they have with schools, particularly Church of England schools. In addition, the website, webinars, partner schools and past and current participants are all instrumental in publicising the programme, its unique characteristics and quality. The Church of England provides over 70% of all the very small schools in rural communities and the CofE NPQ leadership team is committed to trying to attract participants onto the programme to meet their leadership needs with the offer of bursaries.

The success of the various recruitment strategies is reflected in the growing number of applicants and the expansion of the programme so that CEFEL becomes a national provider. The number of recruited participants was well over target in Year 2 and admissions indications for Year 3 show that they are likely to recruit an even higher proportion against the target figure. The provider works with Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic Educators (BAMEed) to actively reach out to BAME and LGBT networks. The numbers of participants from non-white British backgrounds exceeded targets in both Year 1 and Year 2. However, meeting targets to recruit from schools where 30% or more of pupils are known to be eligible for FSM is a challenge because of the demographics of church schools from where most participants are drawn.

The admissions policy and application process are clearly detailed in the ‘Terms and Conditions’ document and set out the need of obtaining the support of a sponsor and the identification of a suitable mentor who needs to be approved by the sponsor. The processes for withdrawal and deferral are also explained well.

<b>E Transparency</b>	<b>10</b>
-----------------------	-----------

Evidence base/Evidence source:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Leadership and management discussions
- Review of the website, policies and documentation

Evaluation:

Transparency exceeds expectations.

CEFEL’s easy to access website provides detailed and helpful information relating to all aspects of the CofEPQH. Prominent is the statement, ‘Rooted in the Church of England’s Vision for Education, this programme provides rigorous preparation for leading a school for the first time or getting ready to take on a new challenge.’ The ‘Clear Expectations’ document describes the duration, time spent in residential face-to-face sessions, webinars and school placement as well as costs. Different areas of the website allow prospective applicants an excellent opportunity to review important considerations such as the application process, bursary, mentor and assessment information. The guidance relating to scholarship funding is well set out and provides clarity about the eligible dioceses. Access to the document, ‘Year 1 Evaluation (2018/2019) is particularly useful to anyone considering CEFEL as a provider and includes elements such as, ‘Participants’ experience of the programme’ and ‘Impact of the ‘Programme’. ‘Participant stories’ provide an exceptionally well-considered opportunity to be transparent about the programme and outcomes.

The website and documentation all comply with the DfE guidance regarding the use of DfE and NPQ branding and performance against the provider metrics is clearly displayed, making them publicly available.

<b>F Continuous improvement</b>	<b>8</b>
---------------------------------	----------

Evidence base/Evidence source:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Leadership and management discussions
- Participant discussions
- Facilitator and host discussions

- Review of the website, policies and documentation
- Participant evaluations
- Minutes of the Steering Group

**Evaluation:**

Continuous improvement meets expectations.

The provider demonstrates a clear understanding of its strengths in the most recent Self-Assessment Report. This stems from a thorough and continuous evaluation of feedback from participants captured by surveys and feedback from hosts/facilitators, especially through the 'Feedback Log'. While CEFEL identifies areas for improvement through this feedback, they are not incorporated into the Self-Assessment Report, thereby limiting its capacity to drive continuous improvement and for the report to act as a vehicle by which the Steering Group can monitor and evaluate improvement.

Leaders demonstrate a strong commitment to continuous improvement by quickly responding to guidance from the DfE, for example in relation to integrated curriculum and financial planning (ICFP) and teacher workload, to make changes in content. Another good example of this commitment is in relation to the work done on assessment, which has been an area in which participants have shown a lower degree of satisfaction in the past. An assessment handbook is now provided at the start of the programme, assessment briefings are being held at each learning event and all regional hosts have been trained as assessors. The provider is acutely aware of the important role that mentors play in supporting participants to develop to the best of their ability. Consequently, it continues to work closely with the dioceses to ensure that there is a better consistency of high-quality mentors and that their performance is continuously evaluated.

New evidence and research is constantly under review to consider its relevance and importance to the programme. CEFEL has good links with several universities, including Cambridge, University College London and Winchester which ensures that it considers a broad range of material. The Programme Lead is skilled at synthesising what is most relevant so that participants gain from this valuable resource. In addition, collaboration with the Farmington Institute is enabling the provider to learn from the research of current educators.

<b>G Complaints and appeals procedures</b>	<b>8</b>
--	----------

**Evidence base/Evidence source:**

- Self-Assessment Report
- Leadership and management discussions
- Review of the website, policies and documentation

**Evaluation:**

Complaints and appeals procedures meet expectations.

A Complaints Policy is available online and sets out a clear, robust procedure that will be followed in the event of a participant having a concern or complaint. This includes an 'informal' stage in which participants contact their regional host and then escalation to a 'formal' stage at which the Head of Programmes becomes involved. If a participant is not satisfied by the response, then a review can be requested by the Deputy Chief Education Officer (Leadership Development). No formal complaints have been received to-date. However, should they arise the provider is committed to keeping a record and monitoring the information gained to inform good practice on the programme and/or the operation of the complaints procedure. If a participant appeals about the outcome of their final assessment, CEFEL works in line with NPQonline's processes and guidance.

<b>H Preventing and dealing with malpractice and maladministration</b>	<b>8</b>
--	----------

**Evidence base/Evidence source:**

- Self-Assessment Report
- Leadership and management discussions
- Review of the website, policies and documentation

**Evaluation:**

Procedures for preventing and dealing with malpractice and maladministration meet expectations.

The Academic Misconduct Policy is focused on plagiarism which is regarded as academic misconduct. It gives a helpful definition and guidance about what a participant can do to ensure that if their final assessment incorporates material from other authors, it is 'clear and unambiguous'. This policy is available online for participants, facilitators and mentors to view. Quality assurance processes are in place for the delivery team in order to monitor performance and disciplinary procedures are outlined in a detailed document in the case of concerns about those on consultant contracts. The Head of Programmes is responsible for ensuring that the CofEPQH is delivered appropriately and reports to the Deputy Chief Education Officer (Leadership Development), who maintains oversight.

<b>Provider's provision</b>	<b>Score</b>
-----------------------------	--------------

<b>I Design of content</b>	<b>9</b>
----------------------------	----------

Evidence base/Evidence source:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Leadership and management discussions
- Participant discussions
- Facilitator and host discussions
- Review of the website, policies and documentation
- Programme observation

**Evaluation:**

Design of content exceeds expectations.

The Learning Event 3 session observed for the Midlands Region demonstrated how well the content has been designed to meet the needs of both current headteachers and aspiring headteachers. The theme of 'the first 100 days of headship' provided participants time to consider what the priorities are in this critical phase of leadership. Excellent use was made of a resource linked to the work of Sir David Carter, encouraging participants to think critically about their own values and priorities. Individual reflection time, and that with a colleague/s was skillfully built in to ensure that a variety of learning opportunities were provided to assimilate the content.

The provider has made effective use of a range of experience and expertise in designing the content, including consultants, the central team and representatives from the partner schools. The partner schools constantly review the materials, particularly to make sure that they are grounded in current practice, while the Programme Lead scans the most recent educational research to keep content 'live'. Thorough evaluation after every face-to-face session by both participants and facilitators ensures that the content is adjusted following delivery in each region and that it continues to meet the needs of leaders in different contexts.

<b>J Types of study</b>	<b>8</b>
-------------------------	----------

Evidence base/Evidence source:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Leadership and management discussions
- Participant discussions
- Facilitator and host discussions
- Review of the website, policies and documentation
- Programme observation

**Evaluation:**

Types of study meets expectations.

Participants frequently cite that the opportunities the programme provides for both self-reflection and critical reflection of good practice, innovation and literature in leadership, including that outside of the school context, as the main strength. Every face-to-face session begins with a period of quiet reflection in which the regional host helps to set the scene for the day’s learning within the guiding principles of the Church of England Vision for Education. Reflection time permeates the rest of each residential day, as well as within ‘Action Learning Sets’ and webinars. At the face-to-face session observed, participants made effective use of self-reflection and reflection with colleagues, often making notes in their own learning journals.

Action Learning Sets are a key feature of study within the CofEPQH and enable three or four participants who are in the same geographical area to continue their learning. They provide a structured way for participants to share school issues they are currently facing, based on the themes and information presented in face-to-face sessions. The process is clearly set out in the handbook so that participants can gain as much help as they can through interaction with their peers. Webinars complement the face-to-face sessions and give participants an excellent opportunity to learn from a good range of educational leaders at the same time. The webinars make effective use of a platform that allows participants to work together via a video link. The success of the platform has been crucial to the decision to develop the mixed-mode delivery and now programme leaders want to adapt current online resources so that they better meet the needs of participants who will not access as many face-to-face sessions.

Participants state how important the mentor is to their development and success in the programme. The role of the diocese, who appoint and monitor the work of the mentors, is therefore critical to ensure that they all have the skills and qualities that are needed. Programme leaders are aware, particularly with the expansion of the programme and working with new dioceses, that training and assuring their quality remains a priority.

<b>K Availability of venues</b>	<b>8</b>
---------------------------------	----------

- Evidence base/Evidence source:
- Self-Assessment Report
  - Leadership and management discussions
  - Participant discussions
  - Facilitator and host discussions
  - Programme observation

Evaluation:  
Venue availability meets expectations.

Hotels provide the venues for face-to-face sessions and they are continually under review in order to ensure that they are fit-for-purpose and provide value for money. Participant feedback is central to making decisions and so, for example, the lowest scoring venue in 2018-2019 in the Midlands has been replaced with another venue. With the increasing number of regions, the residential programme will become far more accessible to participants across the country and they will be able to select the venue closest to their home. The size of the room where participants were observed as part of the review was perfectly adequate for the numbers involved. However, the room had no natural light which is a requirement of the provider and is to be followed up by the Operations Support Officer with the venue concerned.

<b>L Support for participants</b>	<b>9</b>
-----------------------------------	----------

- Evidence base/Evidence source:
- Self-Assessment Report
  - Leadership and management discussions
  - Participant discussions
  - Facilitator and host discussions
  - Review of the website, policies and documentation



- Programme observation

Evaluation:

Support for participants exceeds expectations.

The regional structure for the delivery of CofEPQH, combined with the work of the central team, ensures that participants are extremely well supported at every stage of their leadership journey. The Operations Support Officer within the central team is often the first port of call for participants with questions or concerns and ensures they are directed to the most appropriate person or team if she is unable to deal with them. The individual needs of participants are carefully met, including those with disabilities, for example regarding accessibility at venues.

Diocesan Education Teams support the programme by signposting mentors and providing additional help, if required. Mentors encourage participants to apply their learning from the programme to the writing of their final assessments and offer feedback as they develop. A plan is in place to help ensure there is a consistency of knowledge and understanding of mentors to do this. Skilled facilitators adapt the content and their approach to meet the needs of participants and make effective use of peer group discussions to enhance learning.

A significant strength of the programme is the exceptional support offered by the regional hosts. In the face-to-face session observed, their warm and caring manner created the kind of ethos for learning that served as a model for participants to create in schools. All the NPQ programme ‘hosts’ have received assessor training from NPQonline, so they are well able to support participants as they prepare for final assessment.

**M Accurate assessment of participants (metrics 4 and 5)**

**8**

*[Commentary in this section will need to reference the proportion of participants that will present for their final assessment within 18 months of formally starting their programme]*

Evidence base/Evidence source:

Evaluation:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Leadership and management discussions
- Participant discussions
- Facilitator and host discussions
- Review of the website, policies and documentation
- Programme observation
- Metric 4 and 5 data

Accurate assessment of participants meets expectations.

The development of the partnership with NPQonline includes one of its consultants contributing to every face-to-face learning event. This combined with the experience and expertise of the Programme Lead and the regional hosts, who contribute to the facilitation, ensures that participants are well supported in achieving the NPQH qualification. Detailed guidance about assessment is provided in several very helpful documents to support participants, including for example, ‘Assessment Advice on Potential Pitfalls’, ‘Exemplar T1 and T2 Assignments and ‘Assignment Best Practice Advice from NPQonline’. Several of the interviewed participants raised concerns about the quality and usefulness of the input by NPQonline at the face-to-face sessions, which matches with the feedback the provider has already received. In addition, participants would like some individual time to be provided to discuss their tasks and assessment rather than within a group.

The provider does not just rely on the work of NPQonline to help improve the quality of participants’ submissions for assessment and at the end of 2018/19 conducted a very useful review of internally

moderated assignments. This demonstrates its commitment to using the outcomes of the assessment process to revise and refresh programme content and delivery. Participants' attendance and progress is tracked rigorously, and the data collected is used well to ensure that participants present for assessment within the window they have advised and within 18 months of formally commencing the programme (Metric 4). At the time of the review only one participant had failed to do this, thus the Metric 4 score currently stands at 98.5%. The accuracy level for final assessments (Metric 5) stands at 100%. However, national moderation in August 2019 found that internal moderation by NPQonline indicated that not all initial assessment marking is completely secure, for example moving one mark from a '0' to a '1'.

<b>N Use of participant feedback (Metric 6)</b> <i>[Commentary in this section also needs to include an aggregated mean rating of participant feedback scores as part of the evidence gathering process.]</i>	<b>8</b>
--	----------

Evidence base/Evidence source:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Leadership and management discussions
- Participant discussions
- Facilitator and host discussions
- Review of the website, policies and documentation
- Metric 6 data

Evaluation:

Use of participant feedback meets expectations.

Formal feedback from participants at the end of each learning event is considered as vitally important in evaluating provision and participants' experience of the programme. The provider makes effective use of its analysis to help bring about continuous improvement, including during fortnightly CofEPQH team meetings. The 'Feedback Log' which is accessed by hosts, facilitators and the central team provides a complementary evaluation and helps to triangulate the evidence gained from participants. A continuous dialogue with regional hosts ensures that day-to-day feedback from participants is quickly captured and made use of to bring about improvements to content, delivery and support. Past participants were used well in programme delivery in 2018-2019 by hosting a webinar in which they shared feedback and their learning with current participants.

The QAA's data gives the overall aggregated mean rating for the QAA participant survey scores for both Round 1 and Round 2 as 8.18 (Metric 6), which is a little above the national figure of 7.80. However, the provider's performance against this metric appears to be improving from 7.80 in Round 1 to currently 8.56 in Round 2. The strongest rating is that regarding 'the level of expertise in the delivery of the NPQ trainers', at 9.26 and significantly above the next highest ratings of 8.91. The weakest response remains that of 'accessing pre-application information via the website, with regard to assessment requirements. The rating is 7.61 which is markedly different from other ratings but still well above the benchmark threshold score of 6.00.

<b>O Participant retention and achievement (metric 7)</b>	<b>8</b>
---	----------

Evidence base/Evidence source:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Leadership and management discussions
- Metric 7 data

Evaluation:

Participant retention and achievement meet expectations.

In Year 1 retention was good, with an overall rate of 94%. Currently, in Year 2 the rate is impressive, at 100%, because there have been no withdrawals. There are no significant differences in retention

between groups with protected characteristics, leaders from schools with different levels of performance, leaders from secondary/primary schools or with scholarship status. The QAA’s achievement data to 31 August 2019 for 2017/18 starters only shows 91% (73 out of 80) of participants as being successful with their final assessment and passing the NPQH. There are no discernable differences in achievement rates between groups.

### 5 Overall Assessment of provider’s performance

1a.	Overall alignment to Content and Assessment Framework	<p>The CofEPQH programme, which incorporates NPQH, is fully aligned to the Content and Assessment Framework (CAF).</p> <p>CEFEL meets or exceeds all CAF standards and requirements in the Quality Framework.</p>
1b.	Recommendations for further improvement	<p>Requirement A – General Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase the strategic role of the Steering Group, particularly in order to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- more robustly evaluate the quality and impact of programmes, including through routine scrutiny of the latest Self-Assessment Report;</li> <li>- rigorously monitor the progress of improvement priorities and the associated actions;</li> <li>- regularly review the most significant risks to maintain high quality provision and outcomes, including those related to the expansion of the programme into three additional regions and the outsourcing of assessment marking.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Requirement C – resourcing and contingency planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue to build capacity and ensure succession within the delivery team, by identifying and recruiting high quality facilitators who are committed to the Church of England Vision for Education.</li> <li>▪ Draw up a plan to ensure that in the event of accreditation being removed, provision is made for participants on programmes to complete their study and final assessment with another provider/s.</li> </ul> <p>Requirement F – Continuous Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Develop the Self-Assessment Report in order that it becomes a key driver in continuous improvement by identifying the most significant priorities which will further increase CEFEL’s success.</li> <li>▪ Maintain the focus on developing an effective partnership with all the dioceses, particularly to ensure that mentoring is of a consistently high quality.</li> </ul> <p>Requirement J – Types of study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Adapt online resources in order to better meet the needs of participants who are, or will be, studying on the mixed mode programmes.</li> </ul> <p>Requirement M – Accurate assessment of participants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Review the involvement of NPQonline in face-to-face sessions in response to participants’ evaluations and their desire for a more individual approach to getting feedback on their projects and tasks, prior to submission for assessment.</li> </ul>

2.	Provision is grounded in high-quality evidence and research	The Programme Lead scans the most recent educational research and incorporates the best that is relevant into the content material. In addition, effective links with several notable universities means that the provider is well-placed to access high quality research.
3.	Overall aggregated mean score (see detailed scores in section 4)	Aggregated mean score: 8.40

### 6 Best practice identified

Exceptional performance / best practice identified	Opportunities for sharing and disseminating with other providers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Wise, compassionate and effective leadership at every level which ensures that participants benefit from a unique experience to gain the NPQH, built on the Church of England’s Vision for Education.</li> <li>▪ The success of CEFEL’s engagement strategy, particularly with the dioceses, which is evident in its continued growth.</li> <li>▪ The transparency of provision and outcomes.</li> <li>▪ The regional structure for the delivery of CofEPQH, combined with the work of the central team, which ensures that participants are extremely well supported at every stage of their leadership journey.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Delivery of workshops at national conferences and learning labs.</li> <li>▪ The publishing of case study materials.</li> </ul>