



**Additional questionnaire data**

**summary of findings**

**Autumn term, 2006**

**Data collected by Test Bed evaluation team at Manchester Metropolitan University**

**Report prepared by**

**Derek Woodrow**

**Qualitative Evaluation Team**

**Institute of Education, Manchester Metropolitan University**

**Quantitative analysis by**

**Jean Underwood and Gayle Dillon**

**Psychology Division, Nottingham Trent University**

## Contents

<b>Background</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>The learner questionnaire</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<i>Overview</i> .....	<i>4</i>
<i>Using ICT</i> .....	<i>4</i>
<i>Homework subjects</i> .....	<i>4</i>
<i>Overall</i> .....	<i>5</i>
<i>Data transfer</i> .....	<i>6</i>
<b>The headteacher questionnaire</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<i>Overview</i> .....	<i>7</i>
<i>Staffing issues</i> .....	<i>7</i>
<i>Role and turnover of technical staff</i> .....	<i>7</i>
<i>Methods of communication</i> .....	<i>9</i>
<i>Equipment booking and obtaining daily notices</i> .....	<i>10</i>
<i>Transfer of data and parental remote access to information</i> .....	<i>10</i>
<i>Parental contact with school</i> .....	<i>10</i>
<b>The teacher questionnaire</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<i>Overview</i> .....	<i>12</i>
<i>Curriculum and content management</i> .....	<i>12</i>
<i>Digital resources</i> .....	<i>13</i>
<i>Useful commercial materials</i> .....	<i>14</i>
<i>Email communication</i> .....	<i>14</i>
<i>Assessment</i> .....	<i>15</i>
<i>Teacher use of technology for assessment</i> .....	<i>16</i>
<i>Impact of technology on assessment</i> .....	<i>16</i>
<b>Appendix</b> .....	<b>18</b>

## **Background**

In response to queries raised at a meeting of the Test Bed evaluation steering group, three questionnaires were designed by the qualitative Test Bed evaluation team based at Manchester Metropolitan University. The questionnaires targeted learners, teaching staff and head teachers and were completed during the 2006 autumn term (the fourth and final year of the Test Bed project). They were intended to explore further a number of findings of the qualitative team, some of which had arisen from the published reports (see appendix) and others from interviews regularly carried out with headteachers and ICT Test Bed co-ordinators.

The questionnaires were initially analysed by the quantitative team at Nottingham Trent University and the qualitative questions and then analysed by the qualitative team at Manchester Metropolitan University.

All figures presented are percentages.

## The learner questionnaire

### Overview

In total, 760 learners drawn from 17 of the 28 Test Bed schools completed the questionnaire (31 per cent Barking and Dagenham, 39 per cent Durham and 30 per cent Sandwell). Twenty-nine per cent were Year 11, 29 per cent Year 8 and 42 per cent Year 6 students. The returns from primary and secondary schools reflects the overall sample distribution.

### Using ICT

The findings on computer usage<sup>1</sup> (see Table 1) agreed with the general findings from the qualitative studies that a large majority of students have home access: almost three quarters used home computers for school work every week. 10 per cent of the students used library facilities at least once per week; given that most primary schools did not have a library, this implies a higher proportion of secondary students used libraries.

**Table 1: Percentage of learners using a computer for school work by location**

Location	Do not use here	Less than once a month	At least once a month	At least once a week	Most days
School computer suite	15	6	10	44	25
Home	13	6	9	19	54
School library	78	7	6	7	3
Public place/library	63	15	11	7	4
How often non ICT lesson	14	11	16	34	25

ICT is not fully embedded yet, but 35 per cent of students are now regularly submitting some homework electronically, with a further 26 per cent doing so occasionally. However, 38 per cent of students stated that they never handed in their homework electronically. Differences between the age phases were noted, with 65 per cent of primary pupils stating they never or rarely submitted work electronically, in comparison to 40 per cent of secondary pupils.

### Homework subjects

The students were asked to name the two subjects in which they used computers most frequently for doing homework.

### Year 6

In Year 6, nine subjects were mentioned, including thematic activities or project work: literacy (47 per cent); history (33 per cent); mathematics (17 per cent); science (13 per cent); geography (six per cent); ICT (four per cent) and thematic work (four per cent) with minimal references to religious education (two per cent) and art (one per cent).

<sup>1</sup> See also the *ICT Test Bed : Learner perceptions of the impact of ICT on their education*

Some 13 per cent of Key Stage 2 pupils never used a computer for homework, while 23 per cent did not respond to the question. This may be because home is given less frequently in primary school than in secondary school.

### **Year 8**

In Year 8, twelve subjects were mentioned, with ICT (43 per cent); English (37 per cent); mathematics (25 per cent) and history (25 per cent) being the subjects that a computer is most frequently used for. Geography (nine per cent); design (nine per cent); science (eight per cent); religious education (five per cent); modern foreign languages (five per cent); art (three per cent) and drama (0 per cent) were also mentioned.

In this year group, five per cent stated that they never used a computer for homework and a further eight per cent did not respond to the question.

### **Year 11**

In Year 11, 16 subjects were mentioned with ICT (59 per cent of respondents) and English (39 per cent) as the two subjects that students most used a computer for. These were followed by science (12 per cent), history (13 per cent), design technology (13 per cent) and business studies (12 per cent). Sports, travel studies and health studies students used the computer more often for homework than mathematics students, who were regularly reported to the researchers as one of the most regular groups of users of computers in classrooms.

Over 94 per cent of Year 11 students used a computer for homework. Only one per cent of students said that they never used a computer for homework, while five per cent did not respond.

These data also reflect the greater tendency in some subjects to involve course or project work as a substantial part of the assessment, which might diminish as government plans to reduce course work take hold.

### **Overall**

Given its status in the national curriculum, it might be expected that English would feature prominently, but the comparatively high usage for history in both Years 6 and 8 is noteworthy and almost certainly reflects the use of the internet to obtain information for presentations.

Pupils across all the year groups report that less than half of their teachers (54 per cent) return work electronically but there is a core of teachers, who use this mode of communication daily (eight per cent) (Table 2).

**Table 2: Activities computers are used for when completing schoolwork**

Activity	Never	Once a term	Once a month	Once a week	Most days
Use internet at school for schoolwork	9	6	14	35	37
Use internet at home for schoolwork	22	7	16	27	29
Digital camera or video camera for schoolwork	56	19	12	9	4
Email to contact friends about schoolwork	52	10	11	12	14
Instant messaging/online chatting to discuss schoolwork	58	7	7	11	17

**Data transfer**

The most common methods of transferring school work between school and home was via external access to the school intranet, memory stick and email, although regular use of these methods is still only for a minority of pupils (Table 3). When analysed by age phase, secondary pupils were much more likely to use email and memory sticks for data transfer whilst primary pupils were more likely to use a laptop than secondary pupils.

**Table 3: Types of data transfer for school work**

Location	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Often
Internet	33	11	20	35
Email	51	18	12	17
Memory stick	48	17	13	21
Laptop	65	16	8	11
Other method	99	0	1	1

The students were asked to indicate how often they were blocked from accessing websites at school and home when they were surfing the internet for their schoolwork (Table 4). Blocking occurred most frequently at school, with 67 per cent stating that they were often or occasionally blocked at school, in comparison to just 17 per cent at home. Only 10 per cent stated that they were never blocked at school, compared to 62 per cent at home. At home, secondary pupils were less likely to be blocked than primary pupils, although the reverse was true for school use. Secondary students were far more likely than their primary counterparts to report being unable to access certain websites at school. No data were collected as to the nature of these websites.

**Table 4: Frequency of website blocking at school and home**

Activity	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Often
How often is the website blocked from school	10	22	30	37
How often is the website blocked from home	62	21	9	8

This data on encountering 'blocked' websites suggested that it was a much greater problem than was reported by teachers in the qualitative studies, though it was explored in a survey<sup>2</sup> involving extensive questioning of students. This would suggest that teachers are generally unaware of how often their students are frustrated by not having access to the website they wanted, though they are also perhaps reassured that the protection of learners by blocking websites is effective.

<sup>2</sup> See also the ICT Test Bed : Learner perceptions of the impact of ICT on their education

## The headteacher questionnaire

### Overview

In total, 16 primary headteachers completed the questionnaire. Of these, 31 per cent were from Barking and Dagenham, 50 per cent from Durham and 19 per cent from Sandwell. Secondary headteachers and colleges principals were not surveyed.

### Staffing issues

Headteachers were asked whether being an ICT rich school aids staff retention, to which 69 per cent agreed, six per cent disagreed and 25 per cent stated that it made no difference.

They were also asked whether being an ICT well-equipped school made it more difficult to recruit suitable supply staff. Half of the headteachers did not think it made it more difficult but we cannot infer from this question that it can be interpreted as facilitating recruitment. A further 25 per cent thought it made recruitment of supply teachers harder and 25 per cent thought it made no difference.

The view that being in a rich ICT environment had aided staff retention confirmed the anecdotal evidence we had gathered, though there has been a general trend in primary schools for staff to be rather static.

### Role and turnover of technical staff

To explore the changing role of the technicians during the project, the headteachers were asked to indicate how involved the technicians were in different ICT related activities in school on a five point scale (Table 5). Unsurprisingly, the technicians were heavily involved in the installation and maintenance of new equipment in the first year of the project (81 per cent in 2003). This was followed by technician involvement in the installation and organisation of resources and software (62 per cent high involvement). Overseeing the management information system (MIS) in the first year of the project did not always involve the technician. There was a bimodal split between high and low MIS involvement in the first year, with technician resources being weighted towards installing the influx of hard and software, rather than focusing on more specific issues such as implementing an MIS. Whilst the technicians were still heavily involved with installing and maintaining equipment in the fourth year (69 per cent in 2006), this had fallen, suggesting the flow of new equipment had slowed and ongoing maintenance was a key part of their jobs. This is backed up by indications that technician support for teachers and learners with new equipment had declined from 63 per cent to 19 per cent high involvement between 2003 and 2006, which could also reflect the growing expertise of the teachers in managing new equipment.

**Table 5: Technician roles in 2003 and 2006**

Activity	Low involvement		Mid involvement		High involvement	
	2003	2006	2003	2006	2003	2006
Installing and maintaining equipment	19	19	0	13	81	69
Installing and organising resources and software	19	25	19	25	62	50
Maintaining and overseeing MIS network	50	25	6	13	44	63
Teacher/learner support with new equipment	19	50	19	31	63	19

The heads indicated that in the first year of the project 25 per cent of their technicians left the school. This turnover increased in subsequent years, with half of the schools experiencing a change in years two, three and four. The main reason for change was due to acceptance of external promotions (44 per cent), followed by promotion within the school (25 per cent) and a general change in duties for the staff member (six per cent). Illness, retirement and other causes were not cited as causes for change (Table 6).

**Table 6: Reasons for change of technicians**

Reason	No	Yes
Technician change due to external promotion	56	44
Technician change due to internal promotion	75	25
Technician change due to change of duties	94	6
Technician change due to illness/maternity leave	100	0
Technician change due to retirement	100	0
Technician change due to other	100	0

Changes in technician roles were to be expected, but the high turnover of technicians is noteworthy. It was reported in the qualitative evaluation that there is a lack of a professional structure for technicians, together with a shortage of expertise. Some schools had noted that it took some time for their technicians to really be at home with their systems and each change of technician slowed down progress. We have commented in the final qualitative report<sup>3</sup> on the need for an outside body (such as the LAs) to provide support and training to technicians.

<sup>3</sup> ICT Test Bed qualitative evaluation final report 2007.

## Methods of communication

The data on communications needs to be seen in the context of verbal and interpersonal communication being most common in smaller sized schools, such as primary schools. The most common method for headteachers to communicate with pupils was via a printed newsletter (44 per cent usually) and email (40 per cent usually). Communicating via a newsletter was also the most frequent way of communicating with parents and teachers (80 per cent and 47 per cent respectively). The most infrequent method of communicating with pupils was via the school website (71 per cent). Headteachers make little use of text messaging to communicate with parents and teaching staff. The range of methods of communication with staff was restricted in comparison to communications with parents and pupils. Heads preferred more traditional means when communicating with staff, for example through a newsletter or the notice board, whereas in communications with pupils and parents, a wider and more contemporary range of methods were utilised.

**Table 7: Methods of communication between pupils, parents and teacher**

	Pupils			Parents			Teachers		
	Never	Occasionally	Usually	Never	Occasionally	Usually	Never	Occasionally	Usually
Through the intranet / outlook	27	40	33	73	27	0	79	21	0
Through the school website	71	14	14	14	36	50	62	15	23
Through a printed news letter	38	19	44	0	20	80	27	27	47
Through email	13	47	40	33	60	7	77	23	0
By texting	56	25	19	87	7	7	93	7	0
By written memo	25	63	13	43	43	14	50	50	0
On the notice board	27	40	33	40	40	20	54	31	15

Communication with pupils and parents through email was much higher than anticipated in the primary school context. The increased use of the school websites in two of the clusters to provide parents, and others, with information and materials to support the pupils was confirmed by the questionnaire responses. The one cluster that had focussed on developing communications through a learning platform, rather than websites, was under-represented in the survey.

### Equipment booking and obtaining daily notices

46 per cent of schools booked equipment online, with a further 31 per cent using email and only 15 per cent using written memos (Table 8). It would appear that this is an example of ICT being used widely because it is fit for purpose. Reporting problems with equipment was done through one main online channel (93 per cent), with a minority reporting problems by email (seven per cent). Teachers reported that they accessed daily information online (33 per cent), through the school notice board (33 per cent) and through email (20 per cent) (see Table 7).

**Table 8: Equipment booking, reporting problems and obtaining information within school**

	Book equipment	Report problems with equipment	Usually obtain the daily information
Online	46	93	33
Through email	31	7	20
By texting	0	0	0
By written memo	15	0	13
On the notice board	8	0	33

### Transfer of data and parental remote access to information

All headteachers reported that electronic transfer of pupil data occurred between primary schools and between primary and secondary schools (100 per cent). In line with the high levels of electronic information transfer between schools, headteachers also reported high levels of remote parental access to information about the curriculum (81 per cent), providing opportunities for commenting on school matters (56 per cent), accessing advice on resources for supporting their children (53 per cent) and accessing information about their child's assessment (38 per cent). The facilities for providing remote access to parents was achieved predominately through the school website (82 per cent of the time) in comparison to through the school intranet (18 per cent).

### Parental contact with school

The heads were asked to indicate whether parents contacted the school through text messages or email. Just over half (53 per cent) indicated that parents contacted them through email, with far fewer parents using text messages (14 per cent). This pattern of contact was reflected in earlier questions probing how the schools made contact with parents. However, despite the low levels of text message use to contact school, 60 per cent of the headteachers suggested that text messaging was a beneficial way for parents to contact the school, closely followed by 56 per cent suggesting that email was a useful method of contact.

The headteachers were also asked 'In what ways email/texting by parents was beneficial' and whether these forms of communicating caused the headteachers any problems. The benefits noted were the immediacy of dealing with problems and the ease with which a record of the query (including the date and time) was kept. There were issues, however, such as overload (one parent was emailing a headteacher daily), reliability of information, email allocation and confidentiality. In some cases, it was unclear who had sent an email

or text (the pupil or some other parent creating problems?) and just who should reply – if an email came into the school email address, deciding whether the teacher or the headteacher should deal with them was not always straightforward, and confidentiality became an issue. Email can also be a means of avoiding face to face contact; it is often easier to be critical when not present. There is also the well known problem of the poor or ambiguous language which emails (and texts) encourage, which might cause unnecessary tensions and raises the issue of monitoring such ‘official’ communications. Clearly there needs to be some protocols established for writing and dealing with emails between parents and the school. One head did question the issue of communication through text messaging. Most official school communications require careful recording, which is not easily managed by text messaging.

The headteachers were also asked to comment if they wished, on ICT Test Bed as an experience for their school. One head commented on the raised self esteem and confidence<sup>4</sup> of the staff, with increased levels of interactivity and improved research skills. Another commented that teaching and learning were transformed, supporting creative problem solving and increased assessment for learning<sup>5</sup>; another noted that collaboration<sup>6</sup> is now a strength, all issues found in the qualitative evaluations. A third headteacher commented that the first year of pain and disruption is now forgotten and a fourth commented that innovation brings stress. Two headteachers commented on their worries about sustainability, one complaining that some staff had been made redundant once the project had finished – in one sense a comment on the prioritisation of the ICT provision. Two commented on the importance of technical support.

---

<sup>4</sup> *ICT Test Bed: Evidence from the workforce*

<sup>5</sup> *ICT Test Bed: Evidence from the workforce; ICT Test Bed: The role of ICT in enhancing learning and assessment*

<sup>6</sup> *ICT Test Bed: The organisation of content and resources*

## The teacher questionnaire

### Overview

In total, 102 teachers completed the questionnaire from twenty primary and secondary schools. Of these, 24 per cent were from Barking and Dagenham, 46 per cent from Durham and 30 per cent from Sandwell. Eighty per cent of the responses were from primary teachers and 20 per cent from secondary teachers. The breakdown of year groups taught by primary teachers is shown in Table 9. A representative sample of sixteen secondary curriculum areas was obtained.

**Table 9: Year groups taught by primary teaching staff**

Reception	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
19	8	13	15	12	15	18

### Curriculum and content management

The teachers were asked to indicate how their year, medium term and lesson plans were constructed and stored (Table 10). For all three types of plans, the majority of teachers indicated that they followed a standard format for recording their planning electronically. Year plans and medium term plans were more likely to be stored online, in comparison to on an individual's own computer, than lesson plans (77 per cent, 80 per cent and 66 per cent respectively). This same pattern was also found when the teachers were asked about planning collaboratively with other teachers, which occurred most frequently when constructing year and medium term plans in comparison to lesson plans (67 per cent, 64 per cent and 46 per cent respectively). Lesson plans were the most likely to contain electronic links to resources (69 per cent) than year or mid term plans (40 per cent and 50 per cent respectively).

**Table 10: Management and storage of teachers' year, medium term plans and lesson plans**

	Year plans		Medium term plans		Lesson plans	
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Is there a standard format used throughout the school/department for recording your planning electronically?	20	79	14	86	16	84
Are your plans stored centrally online (not just on your own computer)?	23	77	20	80	34	66
Are your plans created collaboratively with other teachers?	33	67	36	64	54	46
Do your plans have resources linked to them electronically where appropriate?	60	40	50	50	31	69

The questionnaire data confirmed the findings of the qualitative team: most schools had developed what were, by now, well established electronic planning regimes, in which shared lesson plans and longer term planning were available on shared servers<sup>7</sup>.

### Digital resources

The percentage of digital resources that were authored by the teachers varied from 31 per cent of teachers stating that up to a quarter of their resources were self-created, through to 11 per cent who stated that they had created more than three quarters of their own digital resources (Table 11). Web-based resources made up a large part of the teachers' repository, followed by those that were commercially produced. Resources created with school colleagues and modified versions of resources from the web or other sources formed lower levels of a teacher's resource bank.

This data on digital resources again agreed with the previously reported qualitative studies, in that most resources were teacher created, with web-derived resources also providing a significant contribution. The lower usage of materials created by colleagues and other schools also echoed the findings of the qualitative team, that ownership of resources is critical for their usage and that whilst content creation teams may have a very useful role, their contribution is likely to be limited.

**Table 11: Percentage of digital resources used by teachers by type**

	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76+%
Web-based (used either directly or cached)?	38	30	28	4
Authored mostly by you?	31	27	31	11
Created with school colleagues?	59	29	11	2
Modified versions of resources from the web or other schools or other teachers within same school?	53	34	13	0
Commercially produced?	33	44	19	5

Table 12 displays the percentage of teachers who had created their own digital resources. The majority of teachers had created their own word processed handouts (94 per cent), followed by 90 per cent who had created a presentation. Half of the sample had also created a spreadsheet. More infrequently, teachers reported creating web pages (13 per cent), flash animations (10 per cent) and personalising their work, for example by using mail-merge (six per cent).

<sup>7</sup> *ICT Test Bed reports on: The Organisation of content and resources; Evidence from the workforce; The role of ICT in enhancing learning and assessment*

**Table 12: Percentage of teachers creating their own resources by type**

Resources developed personally	No	Yes
Word processed handouts	6	94
Presentations	9	90
Spreadsheet	50	50
Interactive quizzes/tests	54	46
Video clips	65	35
Games	69	31
Database	69	31
Audio clips	72	28
Resources for voting systems	81	19
Web pages	87	13
Flash animations	90	10
Personalised using mail-merge	94	6
Other	100	0

Exploration of the types of resources that teachers created showed that very few lacked the skills required to develop a wide range of them; the six per cent who had not created a worksheet were evenly spread between secondary and primary, and contained a small group of four teachers (four per cent) who had not involved themselves in ICT to any extent at all. Looking at the spread of usage, many teachers had used a variety of resources and the responses were widely spread.

### Useful commercial materials

One question asked the teachers which software they felt they could not do without. 60 per cent of the teachers responded.

The majority of the secondary teachers mentioned word processing and presentation programs, with occasional mentions of publishing and spreadsheet programs. There were also two or three mentions of video editing software. The primary teacher responses were much more varied, though nearly all references were to programs which supported teacher resource creation. There is a clear distinction between the reliance on generic tools in the secondary sector and the greater use of task specific tools by primary teachers.

While secondary teachers did not mention specific subject related software, primary teachers mentioned a variety of more specific learning programs.

### Email communication

Fifty-four per cent of teachers usually emailed their colleagues whilst at school, compared to 29 per cent who usually did this from home (Table 13). Teachers were far more likely to use email to communicate with their colleagues, than they were to use this medium to communicate with learners or parents.

**Table 13: Teacher use of email to contact colleagues, learners and parents**

	Never	Occasionally	Usually
Colleagues from school	14	33	54
Colleagues from home	19	53	29
Learners	54	38	8
Parents	73	23	4

Most communication in schools is verbal rather than written, and most primary school communities are small enough to enable this. It was therefore encouraging to see that, nonetheless, email communication was used as a means of contacting colleagues by over 80 per cent of the teachers. The figure for contacting learners by email (47 per cent at least occasionally) was higher than expected from the interviews, as was the figure for contacting parents by email (27 per cent at least occasionally).

### Assessment

Teaching staff were asked how they stored assessment information. The majority of teachers stored information electronically (95 per cent), although only 16 per cent made their records available online to students and 15 per cent made records available online to parents.

A majority of teachers used a departmental or school template to create pupil records that were available to their department or school (50 per cent weekly records; 55 per cent monthly records; 86 per cent termly records) (Table 14). A separate question finds that 61 per cent of teachers also used personal templates and this may be a result of a difference in teachers' perceptions of marking records versus formal reporting. For termly records, assessments were most likely to be recorded in a personal but school designed templates (70 per cent) than in teacher designed templates (44 per cent). Monthly records were more evenly split between personal and departmental based templates. Termly records were most likely to be held as part of the school MIS (75 per cent).

**Table 14: Design and storage of teachers' assessment records**

	Weekly records		Monthly records		Termly records	
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Personal and in a template designed personally?	40	61	61	39	56	44
Personal and in a template designed by the school/department?	64	36	58	42	30	70
In a departmental /school template and available to the school/department?	50	50	46	55	15	86
Part of the school management information system?	66	34	61	39	24	75

### Teacher use of technology for assessment

Sixty-seven per cent of teachers used technology to set assignments (Table 15). A further 61 per cent reported that they used technology to make sample assignments available to students, while 44 per cent stated that technology is used to enable students to share in target setting. The lowest response in this section of the questionnaire was to the statement 'technology is used to mark and return student's work' (29 per cent).

**Table 15: Teacher use of technology**

	No	Yes
To set assignments for students	33	67
Make sample assignments available for students	39	61
Enable students to share in setting and assessing achievement of targets	56	44
Enable students to submit assessments to you for marking?	59	41
To mark and return students' work	71	29

### Impact of technology on assessment

In order to capture the effects of this use of ICT for assessment, the teachers were asked, 'how ICT had made a difference to their assessment processes'. There was a high response (84 per cent) to this question with generally very positive responses, which reflect other qualitative evidence that ICT has had a beneficial impact on assessment and monitoring activities in schools.

The following list provides a summary of responses:

- Accessibility was a key issue.
- The ability to share information with colleagues was valued. Comments made included that the school ethos was now 'more collaborative' providing 'common access to subject folders'.
- Efficiency gains were recorded in terms of sorting information, involving less paper. Teaching staff also commented that 'reports were easier but less personal'; that 'amendments were easier'; records were 'permanent and easier to update'; and that 'the ability to time-stamp assignments' was a positive factor. One interesting perspective provided by a reception teacher was that of 'using photographs and pupils deciding what is to be saved' as a personalised record.
- The coherence of reporting and assessing work was reputed to be better using ICT, for example by 'helping teachers to report using a structured framework', enabling them to adopt a 'consistent approach across year groups', with 'better continuity', and 'better links to national standards'.
- Analysis and monitoring were enhanced by ICT, by allowing teachers to 'generate graphs'. ICT was also reported to 'make tracking easier', providing teachers with a 'better overview' of children's attainment. 'student levels put onto e-portal enabled monitoring access by head', making 'records from earlier years easier to compare' with 'better transition information' and 'easier moderation through online submission'.
- Target setting and grade monitoring through the MIS was reported as a 'crucial' development, making the 'recording of SATs and target setting easier', and 'targeting for support more efficient' and 'consistent'.

- Instant feedback was also commented upon, with the additional comment that this was well used by the students.
- Use of IEPs for SEN pupils was noted, as well as improved availability of information for pastoral counselling.

There were, however, one or two interesting negative comments such as:  
'Can't mark essays by easy online marking',  
'No difference to assessment but big difference to monitoring'  
'It is harder to assess students' work when presented in an ICT format'.

## Appendix

Qualitative reports produced by the team at Manchester Metropolitan University are available on the ICT Test Bed evaluation website: [www.evaluation.icctestbed.org.uk](http://www.evaluation.icctestbed.org.uk).

FR: Qualitative evaluation final report 2007

FS1 – FS10: Focused studies

**Heads' / Principals' perceptions of the action planning process in Year 1**

Autumn term, 2003 Bridget Somekh

**Teaching and learning: the impact of whole-class technologies**

Autumn term, 2004 Cathy Lewin, Diane Mavers, Diane Saxon and Derek Woodrow

**Evidence from the workforce**

Spring term, 2005 Cathy Lewin, Diane Mavers, Diane Saxon and Derek Woodrow

**Leadership and management in the three further education college**

Summer term, 2005 Bridget Somekh and Diane Saxon

**Learner perceptions of the impact of ICT on their education**

Summer term, 2005 Janis Jarvis, Diane Mavers, Diane Saxon and Derek Woodrow

**Management information systems and virtual learning environments in schools and colleges**

Autumn term, 2005 J. Jarvis, S Steadman, Diane Saxon and Derek Woodrow

**The role of ICT in enhancing learning and assessment**

Spring term, 2006 Cathy Lewin, Diane Saxon, Derek Woodrow

**The organisation of content and resources**

Summer term, 2006 Diane Saxon and Derek Woodrow with Cathy Lewin

**A case study of the learning platform(s) in one cluster**

Summer term, 2006 Cathy Lewin

**Additional questionnaire data**

Autumn term, 2006 Jean Underwood, Gayle Dillon and Derek Woodrow